MODERN SPEECHES

Revised Edition

$3.00

UNIVERSITY
OF FLORIDA
LIBRARY

1905

COLLEGE LIBRARY

Elsie Groat
Helena Munsaw

[illegible]

MODERN
SPEECHES

MODERN SPEECHES

Compiled by

HOMER D. LINDGREN
SCHOOL OF COMMERCE,
ACCOUNTS AND FINANCE
NEW YORK UNIVERSITY

REVISED
EDITION

LIBRARY

NEW YORK
F. S. Crofts & Co.
1930

COPYRIGHT, 1926, 1930, BY F. S. CROFTS & CO., INC.

808.85
L745m2
c.2

MANUFACTURED IN THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA
BY THE VAIL-BALLOU PRESS, INC., BINGHAMTON, N. Y.

This Book
Is Dedicated to
GEORGE BURTON HOTCHKISS

89755

Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2011 with funding from
LYRASIS Members and Sloan Foundation

http://www.archive.org/details/modernspeeches00lind

PREFACE

In preparing this volume of speeches two purposes have been kept in mind. First, the author has aimed to provide for the general reader and for college students in particular a selection of modern speeches of intrinsic value to be studied for their content and for their significance as standards of composition, orderliness of thought and language, unity, coherence, and emphasis. Second, the volume is planned to enable the student of speaking to choose between the "essay" and the "speechy" type of public speech. The effort has been made to emphasize the difference between actual audience contact and instructive remoteness.

The book offers complete copies of some of the latest public speeches in use today. In choosing them, the object has been to furnish information about speaking as well as suitable examples. The author believes that a collection of speeches that have been recently delivered—with only a few exceptions, all have been given since 1920—should prove of greater value than a collection of speeches in the diction and address of days gone by.

The author has tried to arrange the speeches so that "essayness" and "speechiness" are contrasted. The essay standard is minimized; the speech standard is emphasized. The measure of audience contact is revealed in part by the classification.

The author feels that the speech reported on paper in order to be an example of good speech-making, should possess the following elements:

1. Good standards of composition.
2. Observance of the laws of unity, coherence, and emphasis.
3. A proper length for the occasion.
4. A suitable topic for the particular audience.

5. Evidences in the printed speech that the audience and the speaker reacted one upon the other, as shown by the extempore remarks and the trend of thought.

The classification of the speeches may seem to be somewhat arbitrary. To a certain extent this is necessary; but the author feels that the arrangement is by no means as absolute as one in which the basis of classification is that of the occasion on which the speech was delivered.

The collection has been divided into four parts:

I. Written papers which have been read to an audience manifestly interested in a particular subject.
II. Written papers delivered by a great personality and interesting because written or spoken by that person.
III. Speeches that combine complete rhetorical preparation with a sense of the presence of the audience.
IV. Speeches that are clearly in touch with the audience throughout. These are distinctly speeches as distinguished from essays.

The author feels that "essayness" refers to a literary composition on some special subject, written in a subjective manner. One finds in the essay type of speech little or no attempt to influence the audience. As a result, this type of speech becomes more or less without apparent purpose except that of giving information. On the other hand, "speechiness" may be defined as that type of composition which is primarily objective, more or less persuasive, and which takes into consideration both the audience and the occasion. The attempt is made in this type of speech to make contact with and influence a particular audience to respond. That should be the aim of all purposive speaking.

The speeches in this volume have been chosen from a wide field. The reader will find speeches about many phases of human activity as well as speeches that have been delivered on many and varied occasions. Not all of the compositions in the book are good speeches. Some of them, so far as speech-making is concerned, are poor, although interesting because they are the public utterances of prominent men. Others are excellent examples of modern speech making, displaying splendid composition as well as a desire to influence and persuade.

The hope of the student is competence in speaking. The contrast of the different compositions in this volume will help him to realize that end. The book is prepared primarily for classroom use, where, with the help and guidance of the instructor, the student of public speech will learn to note the differences between good speech-making, objective and sometimes persuasive, and the mere expression of subjective opinions.

The author desires to make special mention of his indebtedness to Professor George Burton Hotchkiss, to whom this book is dedicated; to Professor Edward Jones Kilduff, Head of the Department of Business English, and Professor George Rowland Collins, Acting Director of the Day Division, New York University, School of Commerce, Accounts and Finance for helpful criticism and suggestion; and to Professor Charles H. Woolbert, Professor of Speech in the University of Iowa, for his able constructive criticism of the manuscript and suggestions for its improvement in classification.

The author also thanks all those magazines, newspapers, publishers, and authors who have given him permission to use the material gathered together in this book.

PREFACE TO THE SECOND EDITION

Several alterations and additions have been introduced in this edition of Modern Speeches. In making these changes the author has gladly availed himself of suggestions kindly offered from time to time by various correspondents and friends. He has endeavored to prevent the work from materially exceeding the limits of the original size and has here and there omitted excellent speeches which appeared in the first edition but, because of timeliness, seen fit to omit in this volume. Other speeches, more recent or more suitable, have been selected to take the place of those omitted from the first edition.

The greater part of the volume as it now appears should furnish examples of modern speech-making to the end that the student will be encouraged to form his own judgment, independent of critics and, by reading them orally, improve his own expression. The result should be not only to inspire one to seek a better acquaintance with our finest speakers but also to enable one to choose from among the many of our own day who by appealing to our particular taste or humor can best minister to our pleasure and information.

The speeches should prove of sufficient interest to be read aloud and the emotional or intellectual content of sufficient substance to be studied intensively. Reading them aloud will improve one's dictum and expression; studying them analytically will secure a study of structure and style.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

PART I

PAGE

JOHN R. MOTT
Boyhood, the Greatest Asset of any Nation 3

ALBERT C. RITCHIE
More Business in Government and Less Government in Business 14

VISCOUNT BURNHAM
Welcome to the Associated Advertising Clubs of the World 28

JAMES G. MCFARLAND *Memorial Address* . . 34

IRVINE L. LENROOT
The Press and the Government 39

HENRY A. JEFFRIES
The Salesman as a Collector 47

EDWARD A. FILENE
The Way Out for New England 52

WILLIAM GREEN
Acceptance of the Presidency of the American Federation of Labor 61

PART II

BOB DAVIS
Recalls When Job Hedges Unearthed a Speech for All Occasions 65

JOHN D. ROCKEFELLER, JR.
Character—the Foundation of Successful Business . . 69

WILLIAM E. BORAH *How to End War* . . 74

PAGE

MARTIN W. LITTLETON *Robert E. Lee* . . . 80

JULES J. JUSSERAND *Abraham Lincoln* . . 83

STEPHEN S. WISE
Abraham Lincoln: Man and American 87

LOUIS D. BRANDEIS *Business—A Profession* . 101

ROSCOE POUND *The Frame of Mind* . 109

ELBERT H. GARY *The Science of Business* 112

SAMUEL GOMPERS
The Voluntary Nature of the Labor Movement . . . 120

PATRICK CARDINAL HAYES *Christian Charity* . . 125

FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT
Speech Placing in Nomination for the Presidency of the United States, Governor Alfred E. Smith 131

WARREN G. HARDING
Welcome to the Daughters of the American Revolution . 140

WILLIAM HOWARD TAFT
Address at the Unveiling of a Monument to Chief Justice Salmon P. Chase 144

CHAUNCEY M. DEPEW
The World at Ninety-One 154

CHARLES EVANS HUGHES *Liberty and Law* . . 167

EDWIN ANDERSON ALDERMAN
Woodrow Wilson—Memorial Address 186

PART III

HENRY VAN DYKE *Of Fame* 219

WILLIAM JENNINGS BRYAN *Lincoln as an Orator* . 221

OTTO H. KAHN
The Value of Art to the People 227

PAGE
S. PARKES CADMAN *The Lure of Paris* . . 233
VISCOUNT CECIL OF CHELWOOD *A Great Example* . . 240
WILLIAM C. REDFIELD
Get Facts; Look Far; Think Through 244

SPEECHES CELEBRATING THE EIGHTIETH BIRTHDAY OF THE HONORABLE ELIHU ROOT:

CHARLES EVANS HUGHES
Speech of Introduction 253
ELIHU ROOT *Speech of Response* . . 259
CLARENCE H. MACKAY
The History of Communications 268
CHARLES ZUEBLIN
Did Woodrow Wilson Fail? 276
JEREMIAH WHIPPLE JENKS
America's Rôle in Europe 288
V. H. STONE *The Thoroughbred* . . 304
WOODROW WILSON
The Signing of an Armistice 308
JAMES C. CROPSEY
Responsibilities of Citizenship 310
CALVIN COOLIDGE
To the State Senate on Being Elected Its President . . 318

PART IV

WILLIAM LYON PHELPS *Commencement Address* 325
DAVID LLOYD GEORGE *Our Commission* . . . 334
ELBERT LEE TRINKLE *The Custodians of Glory* 344
THE EARL OF BIRKENHEAD
The Lawyers Who Really Count 350

PAGE

BRUCE BARTON
Which Knew Not Joseph 358

MAURICE SAMUELS
Where the Fruit Is Freedom 365

ROE FULKERSON *Dollar Chasing* . . . 374

JOHN ATKINSON
Welcome to the Society of Certified Public Accountants . 382

ADDRESSES AT A BANQUET IN ROME TENDERED TO THE AMERICAN AMBASSADOR AND TO THE PRIME MINISTER OF ITALY:

RICHARD WASHBURN CHILD
Speech of the American Ambassador 386

BENITO MUSSOLINI
Speech of the Prime Minister of Italy 390

ADDRESSES AT THE PILGRIMS' DINNER IN HONOR OF THE RIGHT HONORABLE VISCOUNT CECIL OF CHELWOOD:

CHAUNCEY M. DEPEW
Address by the President 393

VISCOUNT CECIL OF CHELWOOD *Speech of Response* . . 398

SPEECHES AT THE BANKERS' CLUB, NEW YORK:

JAMES BROWN
Introducing Julius H. Barnes 411

JULIUS H. BARNES
The Problems of Modern Business 411

JAMES J. WALKER
Welcome to the Right Honorable James Ramsay MacDonald 425

JAMES RAMSAY MACDONALD
Response to the Honorable James J. Walker 427

JAMES RAMSAY MACDONALD
Address to the United States Senate 431

PAGE

James M. Beck
The Future of the Supreme Court 435

Arthur W. Loasby
Opportunities for the American Bank Clerk 450

Elmer E. Ferris
The Art of Personal Contact 456

André Morize
"1918–1925"—A Memorial Day Address 464

Edmund E. Day
Accountancy as a Profession 475

Addresses Before the Citizens' Committee, University of Pittsburgh:

Homer D. Williams
Introducing George Wharton Pepper 481

George Wharton Pepper
The Greatest Enterprise of Pittsburgh 483

William M. German *Speech of Response* . . 492

George W. Bain *Platform Experiences* . 494

PART I

Written papers which have been read to an audience manifestly interested in that particular subject.

BOYHOOD THE GREATEST ASSET OF ANY NATION

JOHN R. MOTT

John R. Mott, since 1915 General Secretary of the International Committee, Young Men's Christian Association, is known in every continent for his influence and ability in promoting the work of the Y. M. C. A., particularly among the students of the world. He has been engaged in this work since 1888, his senior year at Cornell University, when he organized the Student Volunteer Movement. He was a member of the Mexican Commission appointed by President Wilson in 1916, and of the Special Diplomatic Mission to Russia in 1917, and directed the war work of the Y. M. C. A. He is the author of numerous writings on social and evangelistic topics. Doctor Mott was born in Livingston Manor, New York, 1865.

During the War, both in the belligerent countries on both sides of the struggle and in virtually all the neutral countries, a new term came into prominence. In the English language it was the word "priorities." By this term was meant the determination of the order of precedence, as it were, of various claims. For example, the order in which certain war materials should be provided and sent forward; or the order in which men should be assembled and in which they should be given right of way on ocean and land transport; or the order in which certain processes should be undertaken and carried through. In brief, what should have right of way? This came to be a governing word in almost every country, and affected the plans of nations at the ends of the earth and influenced the habits of every household among the rich and the poor. We may well take over this term into modern usage in connection with the plans and activities of the Kingdom of Christ on earth. Let us ask ourselves, therefore, what should have right of way in the comprehensive program and multiform enterprises of the Young Men's Christian Association. I would raise the question seriously whether in view of all that confronts us in the present world situation, we have anything to do quite so important as reaching for Christ, His Church, and His program, the boy life of all nations and races. Is it not true that boyhood is the greatest single asset in the life of every nation?

Let us examine the foundations of our belief in this fact. The life of boys is the chief asset of any nation because of their unspent years. If you relate a man in old age or in middle age to Christ and the plans of His expanding kingdom, you are dealing simply with addition; whereas if you bring a boy under the sway of the matchless Christ and interest him in Christ's fascinating enterprise for mankind, you are dealing not with addition but with multiplication. What limitless possibilities are wrapped up in these young lives! What would any man listening to me tonight not do if he might spend those years over again that he called his boyhood! What would we not do if we could live through that period once more! It is related of the great statesman Daniel Webster that one day, as he was walking down the street of a New England village, he took off his hat to a boy he saw coming toward him. A friend who saw the incident asked Mr. Webster why he did so. "It dawned on me afresh," said the statesman, "as I saw the boy, what his brain as it unfolded would witness and have opportunity to promote in the life of the world." With how much more reverence and even trembling you and I, from the point of view of Christ, might view any one of the boys of any nation.

Boyhood constitutes our greatest asset, likewise, because of the unused and unexhausted energies that boyhood connotes. The difference in boys, as Thomas Arnold used to emphasize, is not so much in talent as in energy. Youth is the motive power of the nations—driving them to new ends and bringing them to new hopes. What limitless capacities of energy, enthusiasm, and moral passion are possessed by youth of any land!

The abounding vitality of boyhood suggests again what a priceless asset it is. What should this not mean to us in days like these when the world seems so exhausted and when the vitality of so many nations is so low, to see these multitudes of fresh lives with bounding veins of new blood to be poured into the great visions of our Lord and of His followers!

Another reason why the boys of a nation are its chief asset is because of their unspoiled powers. I see a young boy with fresh bodily energy, with strength and agility of muscle, with eye quickened and undimmed, with ear undulled and keen to detect, with memory retentive and ready, with young curiosity so eager to go in quest of any knowledge, with youthful feelings not yet spoiled by over-excitement and ever ready to admire and love, with active and strong will ready to be blended with heroic, noble, and unselfish purposes of God and man; and again I say, surely boyhood is our most precious possession.

Moreover, the boy life of a nation is its prime asset because boyhood constitutes the most impressionable period in life of men. We might express our aim in a sentence: to capture the plastic nervous system of the youth of the nation and of the world. Boyhood is the period when we are most susceptible to good impressions. I have made a life study of the periods when great appeals lay most powerful hold upon us. It has been impressive as the years have gone on to see the testimony accumulate, showing that of those who make free choice with reference to relating themselves to the Christian Church fully ninety per cent are led to identify themselves with the Church under thirty years of age, and of these a large majority come into such affiliation under the age of twenty. Leading evangelists of different nations give similar testimony with reference to the time of decision for Christ. A consideration of the interesting question as to when men choose their life work brings us to a similar conclusion. What a source of encouragement and stimulus it should be to us to know thus positively that in boyhood men are especially responsive to the higher, the nobler, the more unselfish appeals. But let us be solemnized by the converse, that the plastic years of boyhood are those in which evil influences accomplish their most deadly work. It is a startling fact that the percentage of juvenile crimes increases; and that the average age of first commitment has grown steadily earlier, especially since the War. Crime is becoming more and more precocious.

How true it is that boyhood is our choicest asset because it represents the habit-forming years. They are the years of determining life attitudes and tendencies. There is no more basic fact in physiological psychology and in the experience of youth of every nation than that these are the years in which habits are riveted as with steel upon the lives of boys—habits which will remain with them as men. These are the years of choosing governing ideals and guiding principles. By guiding principles I mean those to which men turn and which they apply in times of doubt and perplexity. These are the years, therefore, of the most momentous decisions. You ask me what are the great decisions which as a rule are made in youth? One of them is, What shall be my relation to God? Another is, What shall be my relation to my generation? Still another, What shall be the investment of my own life? These are indeed the choices on which the lives of men and the welfare of nations depend.

Another vital point which is often overlooked is that boyhood is the period of struggle and strain, the years of the furnace and the forge. I mean that they are the years in which we have our fiercest temptations. How hot is the blood of youth! How it surges through the veins! How sensitive are the nerves of youth! How in these days unbidden thoughts press themselves upon us, it may be even in the form of angels of light.

This is the time also, of great soul struggles. Contrary to the popular impression, souls suffer most as a rule when men are between fifteen and twenty-five. They suffer not from this or that particular sorrow, but every person who really feels or thinks suffers in the days of youth from sorrows, fears, and serious questionings inherent in existence, and men suffer in these years to a degree never experienced in later life. They are called upon in youth to meet life's most critical and difficult problems—the problems of religious belief, of choice of a career, of love. The seriousness of the struggle is accentuated by the reticence and sensitiveness characteristic of the vast majority of youth with reference to these intimate and more sacred matters. Only those of us who sit, as it were, in the confessional for long hours and listen to scores, it may be hundreds or thousands, of boys in the lower and upper teens and in the early twenties, as I have had occasion to do, can have any realizing sense of the great tragedy which is not usually associated in our thought with the cheerful, the buoyant life of boyhood and young manhood.

This leads me to point out that boyhood is a creative period. It is a time not only of physiological second birth, but also the generating moment of many of the great discoveries and notable inventions. It is the great day of beginnings. It is the period of surprise. It is the season of hope. It is the time of thrilling promise. It is the germinating day of the great social emotions and activities which nominally mature in adult life.

Are not these days of boyhood likewise the vision-forming period? "The thoughts of youth," the poet tells us, "are long, long thoughts." In every land and in every time it has been the young men who have swept wide horizons. "Your young men shall see visions." Some one may raise the question, Do not old men have visions? Yes, we answer, but if their visions really command them did they not receive these visions when they were young men? The measure of a man is the measure of his vision. His visions are likewise the strength of his life. How true is that ancient word, "Where there is no vision the people perish!" Thank God our youth today have what to the prudent seem like impossible ideals. The nations and the world are lost unless youth picture to themselves a new day—the day of the new Jerusalem coming down from heaven to earth. Our oncoming generation see and are commanded by this fresh and wondrous vision of beauty, purity, justice, and good will.

The years of youth are also the years of adventure. To youth and daring, with the help of God, all things are possible. They are ready at any time to attempt the impossible and this is truly Godlike. May they never lose this spirit. Almost every great unselfish movement has been the work of youth. Keim points out that most of Christ's disciples were adolescents. In these days above all days we need men of youth mad with enthusiasm for Christ and His heroic program. The new generation, as possibly none of their predecessors, are summoned to warfare against ignorance, poverty, crime, disease, hatred, and strife. Positively they are challenged to apply the principles of Jesus Christ and to bring His spirit to bear upon the whole range of human life and relationships. Let us reverently thank God that we have a generation who do not shrink or flinch from this high warfare.

Reasons emphasizing the transcendent importance of boyhood, such as those already stated, have ever obtained, but today they take on new and overwhelmingly great significance. This is owing to the fact of the alarming shattering and depletion of the boy life of the world during the tragic and fateful decade through which we have just passed. It is also true because of the unparalleled demand of the present and the coming day for vital and heroic service and leadership. To what generation has ever been committed such vast and precious interests? Why has God placed such a colossal, even impossible, burden on the slender shoulders of the oncoming generation? May it not be that it is because He in His omniscience sees that He has at last a generation in preparation with which He can trust a literally world-wide and overwhelming situation?

All that has been said with reference to the importance of boyhood takes on added meaning with reference to the new generation of our day, because of the unique preparation they have received in the war and post-war periods. What have they not seen! What have they not heard! What impressions have not been borne in upon their sensitive souls! What soul struggles have not shaken them! As a life-long student of history I can think of no generation which has been exposed to such intense influences—influences calculated to affect and change so profoundly the psychology, the outlook, the convictions, the purpose of youth.

This wonderful oncoming generation must be won for Christ and must be given adequate outlet for the impulses which are so profoundly moving their souls. We do well to remind ourselves that they have by no means been won for this highest purpose. It is well also that we do not deceive ourselves as to the difficulty of the task.

Here is a generation keenly dissatisfied with the past. You will agree with me that they have abundant reason to justify their dissatisfaction. They are likewise dissatisfied with much of the present. Here again, may they not be more nearly right than those who are not discontented with things as they are? This new generation in all lands is, as a rule, ultra-critical. What do they not criticize today? They are intellectually the most alert and inquiring generation the world has ever known. They are examining all foundations; questioning all sources of authority; criticizing all standards. But is this attitude not vastly more encouraging than the old apathy, indifference, and inertia? They hate sham and hypocrisy; or expressed positively, they are whole-heartedly responsive to reality. They tend to go to extremes; but have we not come to a day when it is highly important that we have a generation who will break out of the old rigid grooves and chart new courses for mankind? Surging in their brains and hearts are tides of new thought and social passion.

Some of us who were in China last year heard much about the New Thought Movement, or, as some characterized it, the New Renaissance. While in Peking attending the Conference of the World's Student Christian Federation, where we mingled with delegates representing the youth of nearly forty nations, we soon came to recognize that China was not alone with reference to a new youth movement, but that in all quarters of the world there were similar stirrings of spirit and concerted earnest efforts to bring in a new day. The delegates from India reported to us that boys and young men had been the motive power behind Gandhi. The Japanese reminded us that the new liberal movement and the anti-militarist tendency of their country owed much of its enthusiasm and contagious power to the growing following of the youth. Delegates from France, others from Germany and other middle European fields, gave interesting reports about new and wonderful youth movements. Similar facts were brought to our attention with reference to some of the Latin American republics. Among the most impressive incidents were those telling of the Russian Communistic Youth Movement with its enormous following. This reminds me that only a few days ago I learned of the great international communistic youth movement which embraces some fifty national and other communistic youth organizations with a membership of 800,000 and is served by some 200 periodicals.

Some of these uprisings and organizations are national, others are international. Among them are movements social, political, racial, moral, religious. They vary in origin, aim, and goal. They have some things, however, in common: they all constitute a protest against the past; in some degree each one represents an insurgence against hampering traditions, restrictions, and customs of home, school, state, or Church; all manifest a burning desire for independence and self-determination; all give evidence of an intellectual quickening, and are characterized by more or less of idealism.

This world-wide phenomenon of a new spirit moving on the troubled waters of the youth of the world, with their new aspirations, hopes, and purposes, presents an absolutely unique opportunity to the Young Men's Christian Association and to all Christian agencies called upon to influence the life and action of boys and young men. The questions and challenges thus presented afford Christianity the opportunity of the ages for furnishing a new and satisfying apologetic. It likewise will serve to encourage and to facilitate the study of Jesus Christ, His teachings and work in the world. Indeed it may help to prepare the way for Christ. Moreover, the social interest and concern which characterize so many of these movements give

Christianity a rare chance to reveal its great and unique power as a social dynamic. The non-Christian religions in this vital respect are powerless. What a challenge is presented to the Associations and the Churches to enlist preachers, apologetic lecturers, teachers, and authors to guide the new thought and to direct the new enthusiasm into most fruitful channels.

Thank God we have a Gospel which can influence and guide these overflowing tides of living interest and passion! To whom else shall they go? Thou hast the words of eternal life. Jesus Christ came not only to win the hearts of the youth by His kindness and to command their wills by His authority, but also to persuade their minds by His truth. He flung out a most satisfying challenge for such an inquiring generation as the one with which we are dealing when He said, "Learn of Me." He not only presented this satisfying challenge but presented Himself as the Truth. In Him this new generation will find a full and adequate answer to their most penetrating questions, because it will be an answer at once reasonable, vital, and self-evidencing.

This oncoming generation is indeed the hope of the world. We must win them for the sake of this maimed, broken, and imperiled world and this for the simple reason that the old generation to which you and I belong, are not going to live long enough to effect the extensive, profound, and permanent changes needed to bring in the new and the better day.

For reasons like these in which I trust we are all united and which should undergird our convictions and purposes, we must conserve at all costs this greatest asset, this priceless asset of each nation. To this end let us bring to bear on the conservation and development of boyhood all powers of mind, heart, and will; all energies or potencies of money, personality, strategy, and organization; all influence of fathers, mothers, older brothers, and sisters; the marvellous streams of power connoted by such words as home, school, state, Church; and, above all, our limitless superhuman resources. Let us guard and safeguard with vigilance, constancy, and jealousy, and above all else that we guard, this wonderful possession, the boyhood of our land. If we would but spend one-tenth on prevention which is now being spent on cure with reference to the ills of boyhood and young manhood, we should have infinitely larger results to show. The time has come to recognize clearly all influences which tend to disintegrate faith and to blast character, and then to declare uncompromising warfare against all these forms of evil.

We must strive, moreover, to invest the priceless asset of boyhood to the very best advantage. This necessitates our securing the best counsel. We should relate to our program as never before the leading minds of the colleges and universities, of the learned professions, of the business and industrial world, of the organizations and movements for social and religious betterment. No man should be regarded as too busy or too important to be called upon to collaborate with us in this undertaking of first importance. Let us bring to the task larger understanding, more comprehensive and profound study, greatly enlarged and more masterly plans, and a far better co-ordination and correlation of all agencies and forces touching the life of the youth of the nations.

In closing, I remind you solemnly that there is an element of urgency about this great undertaking which we have been considering. There are some tasks which we can spread out over many years and take up in a leisurely or deliberate way. Not so this task of winning for Christ, for His way of life and for His warfare, the very flower of the nations. It is to be feared that too many among us are planning and working as though the oncoming generation of boys were to pass through three or four periods of adolescence. As a matter of serious fact they will have but one such period. The Children of Israel took forty years to make a forty-day journey. Let us not assume that we can take four decades to do what must be done in far less than one. Therefore, let every one of us go forth under a sense of the spell not only of the primacy of our work, but also of its immediacy. Then we shall truly serve the new generation by the will of God, and our example will be contagious and highly multiplying in the lives of others.

By permission of the author.

MORE BUSINESS IN GOVERNMENT AND LESS GOVERNMENT IN BUSINESS

ALBERT C. RITCHIE

Albert C. Ritchie, Governor of Maryland, author, and noted speaker, delivered this address at the fourteenth annual meeting of the Chamber of Commerce of the United States, Washington, D. C., May 12, 1926. Mr. Ritchie was born in Richmond, Virginia, August 29, 1876, and, after attending Johns Hopkins University and the University of Maryland, was a professor of law at the latter institution from 1907 until 1920. He practiced law in Baltimore and became attorney-general of Maryland in 1916, remaining in that office until 1920 when he became Governor of the State of Maryland for three terms, 1920–1931.

GENTLEMEN OF THE UNITED STATES CHAMBER OF COMMERCE:

FOR a long time now, whenever opportunity offered, I have been pleading for a reawakening of the political consciousness of America and for a realization of the importance of sound political philosophy.

I have tried to show how our failure to preserve the balance between the powers which the States granted the Nation and those they reserved for themselves, and the failure of the individual to assert the Charter of his Liberties as expressed in the Bill of Rights, have resulted in a breakdown of political fibre and in Federal denial or impairment of some of the dearest and most sacred principles of American life and freedom.

To-day I wish to make the same plea in terms of business.

Personally, I am of the Jeffersonian school of democracy, which believes that that government governs best which governs least, provided it governs wisely. Just as I think that sound government should recognize the right and liberty of the individual to pursue his own life in his own way so long as he does not interfere with like rights and liberties of others, so I think that this great, delicate, human mechanism we call business should be as free as possible from governmental interference, so long as it does not abuse this freedom.

The broad purpose of government in its relation to business should be to keep the door of opportunity and endeavor open to all on equal terms, and to restrain those who would deny this. By the same token government should keep its hands off business so long as business keeps its hands off government and engages in no practices which are unfair or stifling to others.

For three centuries now this country has been undergoing the processes of development. From our earliest beginnings until today progress has been the work of the pioneer. We have advanced from one great economic landmark to another, and to do that we have been quick to throw outworn methods to the scrap heap and to meet and solve each new condition as it arose with individual initiative and enterprise. It was thus that Fulton gave us the steamboat, Cooper the steam engine, Morse the telegraph, Bell the telephone and the Wrights conquered the air.

I would not see this personal initiative shackled, this business individualism checked, by a government which should give it encouragement and free play, so long as it respects the like qualities and enterprise in others.

So were I to try to express the idea I have in mind in one sentence, it would be, put business in government to the full extent you can, but take government out of business except where the great heritage of equality of opportunity necessitates its presence.

This formula is not difficult to express. It embodies the American ideal. The trouble comes in applying it practically.

No problem of modern political life presents more difficulties than that of determining the sound relations of business and government. This is true whether you approach it in the abstract, as the student of political science does, or in the concrete, as the practical lawmaker or administrator does.

Misunderstanding of these relations can be almost as dangerous as their actual abuse, and such misunderstanding I think exists not only on the part of the public but also on the part of both business and government.

During the fifty years since Reconstruction we have witnessed a revolution in the relationship between government and business.

The growth of wealth and of capitalistic combinations was accompanied by an increase of corporate power and concentrated resources and by a domination over State and National politics which were used all too often to crush individual initiative and opportunity. The forms of popular government remained, but real mastery slipped from the hands of the people to a narrow plutocracy. Then a new social justice asserted itself, and the government had to interfere.

After that the pendulum swung, and government let itself fall under the suspicion of attacking business just because it was big. The vital thing is to secure the proper gains of wholesome combination and at the same time preserve to the individual his industrial and political freedom. We are a free people and should be as free to grow big if we keep honest and straight as we should be free to stay apart to ourselves if we wish. So the pendulum swung partly back again.

The net result, however, has been a vast extension of governmental control over railroads and public utilities; legislation, such as the Sherman Act and kindred measures, in the interest of broader freedom for business, and regulation in the field of public health and safety and welfare, as illustrated by workmen's compensation laws, factory laws, inspection laws, building regulations, restrictions on employment and the like.

These things have become accepted now as a necessary part of modern industrial life, and certainly in the main properly so, especially when confined to governmental regulation and checks on the abuse of power as distinguished from direct governmental management.

No survey of government and business to-day can overlook the lessons of the World War. To appraise them truly the results must be checked, because of the stress and emergency of the times and the pressing need for speed. Still the war furnished a great experimental demonstration of co-ordination and combination in the field of industry.

The war gave rise to a demand which was unknown in time of peace,—an absolute demand, to be halted neither by prices nor difficulty of procurement. The resulting shortages had to be met by group action and governmental control of prices and distribution.

United action and co-operation were encouraged, indeed demanded by the Government, and the result was the development of a spirit of service and of fairness towards competitors and the public, as well as the discovery of hitherto unknown and unexploited fields for efficiency, economy, conservation and the elimination of waste. There was, it is true, the impelling incentive of patriotism then, but these object lessons of what can be done by co-ordination of business, no matter on how large a scale if only it is honest and square, must not, with due regard for the established right of competition, be forgotten in time of peace.

It is not generally recognized how much government is actually in business, not as a regulating or controlling force, but in competition with private enterprise. Government, Federal or State, is in the shipbuilding business, the airplane business, maintains warehouses and manufactures furniture, paint, mail boxes, envelopes, clothing, cement and other kinds of material and supplies.

Some of this is doubtless inevitable, but it would be easy to show the resulting economic waste compared with private industry, due to a variety of causes, but perhaps chiefly due to the lack of necessity of showing a profit and to the lack of a permanent policy. Operating costs are regarded as of subordinate importance; losses are frequently absorbed and swallowed up in general accounts. Private business cannot compete. But the citizen pays only indirectly through taxes, and so he is either ignorant of or indifferent to what is going on, although his own tax bill is increased by the tax-exempt feature of the Government's operations.

We must remember that private business has no treasure chest whose contents it does not earn. Public business, on the other hand, has the public treasury.

If actual experiences of this kind do no more, at least they show the economic unsoundness of extending them further, and the need of the country to set its face rigidly against the ill fortunes of government ownership.

With these experiences and observations as a background, let me pass to what, I think, ought to be the philosophy of the relationship between government and business.

Anything that chills the free enterprise of business, or that deadens its initiative, or interferes arbitrarily with the free play of economic opportunity, is destructive both of social and economic progress. Too much government in business does this. It would do this even if government were perfect, instead of one of the most imperfect of all human institutions.

Assuming that the natural law of freedom has its economic as well as its social and political application, and that business should be free to work out its own destiny, then the problem of government is how to prevent abuse and make this freedom function for the common good. I would like to see the time when business writes a charter of American business freedom, a Bill of Rights of its own, to protect itself both from government and from some of its own temptations. For we may admit that there is abuse and misuse of this law of free business both by the government and by business itself. Business cannot escape its share of the blame on either count.

If the price of liberty for the individual is eternal vigilance and a willingness to do right and justice to his fellows, the price of freedom in business is the same. If there is antagonism between government and business, the fault I think lies largely with business; with business, because it has not risen to its political obligations as it should; because it has not been sufficiently conscious of its high estate; and because it has been slow in recognizing both its rights and its duties in its relations to the organized State.

The public at large thinks of business as one thing, and government as another. Let us remember that to-day the nation is business and that business is the nation. It is the common life. You cannot injure business without injuring the nation. Business has assumed the responsibility of feeding man, of housing him, clothing him, transporting him, supporting him. Business is the means and the only means of supplying man with the things he must have to live. Whatever else happens, business must go on; society as organized is absolutely dependent upon it.

There is an idea widespread in many circles that business and particularly big business, or what are called "the interests," have more power in government than they should have. If they have, it is because business misconceives the true functions of the State as well as its own best interests, and in the long run it may have to pay the penalty. If we mean anything by liberty and equality of opportunity we mean not only that business must be free from undue interference and oppression by the government, but also that it must be free from undue entangling alliances with the government. It cannot usurp power that does not belong to it. It cannot use government for its own selfish interests. Business that rests on special privilege and favoritism is no more honest economically than business that rests on corruption.

Business justly rebels against all the paternalism that government tries to exercise over it, but the cardinal mistake business makes is in saying "business is business" and "politics is politics," and on looking upon government too much as a thing apart or as a necessary evil. You cannot condemn politics without condemning government. Politics is public business. This means that business should develop a higher sense of political responsibility. The power and training of business, the ability, the energy, the fidelity that go with it, should be more available to the State.

Because business has looked too much on government as a thing apart, the relations between government and business have always been more or less under suspicion in the public mind, and often unjustly so. In spite of recent scandals, I think that there is less business corruption and less selfish business politics in our governmental system than many people think. Certainly there is far less than there was. Business has discovered that bad business politics is bad for business; the next discovery should be that good business politics is good for business. We know that invisible government is bad government, and business must be alive to the fact that in its relations to government it should, like Cæsar's wife, be above suspicion and play its cards only in the bright light of publicity; that secret covenants secretly arrived at will not do. Much of the credit for progress to this end goes to associations such as yours.

If you complain of too much government in business, I answer that the solution is two-fold: put more business into government and more self-government into business. Give the government no need to regulate what you should regulate yourselves.

I would like to see business embrace a new political philosophy. Business, in a very large sense, is the State. Its own safety and stability demand that it do its part to make government better than it is. These also demand that it do not place too big a burden on government; that it lessen this burden by developing the spirit of self-government righteously applied in its own domain; and that it do not look upon government as a source of selfish protection or special privilege.

We may have faith in the power and the promise of business. The leaders and the architects of our future must come from your ranks, not from the ranks of the politicians, or even from the ranks of the preachers, the professors or any other class. It is the collective mind of an era that shapes that era, and the collective mind of this era is the business mind. If this is so, you are called to a high sense of your obligations.

The power of business is the power that can get efficient and effective results. It should serve the State. Cast your eye over all the ills and evils, the injustices and inequalities and inanities that hedge us about, and ask yourself what force is better equipped than business to cure them and to shape and direct a new and better order. You men are trained to deal with actualities, realities, practicalities; the vital and not the abstract things. Business should not only organize itself but should do more than it does to organize society for that most real of all real things, the common good.

Business must be something more than mere money making. It must be profitable, of course. But no business will be profitable unless it gives service. And to the business which gives service profits will come.

By developing self-government and so managing to throw off the incubus of excessive government interference and regulation, business can solve many of the problems which men now strive to solve through the ballot. Business can do things which government cannot do. It has already done much to humanize industry. It is recognizing that the health, the housing, the education, the economic and the personal welfare of its employees are essentially problems of business rather than of government. Business hitherto has too often left these questions to reformers and uplifters, who, in their zeal to better conditions, have carried questions into politics that should have remained in the non-political domain.

Business should so regulate itself as to relieve the government of the need of doing so. It is developing its own ethics, its own philosophy, its own ideals; it should develop its own self-government. Organized business is often more effective to prevent abuses and punish wrong-doing in its own ranks than is the government armed with the letter of the law. The question is altogether one of the ideals business sets for itself, the goal at which it aims. It is not one of power. The power is there.

Government is too complex and too alive with partisan feeling to handle many questions that business could handle better. And how much has business done to put "more business in government"?

We are the greatest business nation in the world, but our governments, both State and National, do not reflect our business leadership. Here waste and extravagance and inefficiency and indifference flourish to an extent that business itself would not endure for a moment. Only the earnest public official, who has tried to remedy these conditions and to combat all the factors, human and political, and all the inertia, tradition, custom and public indifference which make these conditions possible, can realize what it would mean if business itself gave the proper support and impetus. If business unselfishly recognized its political obligations as it should, it would be the one force in the State that could measurably cure these evils. When the business interests of this country once really mean what they say in demanding "more business in government," then will government be more business like.

Neither society nor business should look too much to legislation to solve its economic or social problems. Government must deal with such abuses as a self-governing business fails to suppress. It can do no less. It should need to do no more. So the power, the opportunity, the privilege of self-government lies with you.

To-day the public is as bitter against the profiteers in food and in fuel, in clothing and in rents, as it was against the railroads and the trusts a generation ago. If business itself does not find the cure, government will undertake to find it, and that will mean more legislation, more departments, more bureaus, more inspectors, more appropriations.

These things will come in an age when there is already too big a strain upon our political machinery. All over the world legislative bodies have suffered a decline in power and prestige largely because they have assumed a burden which business itself should have borne. To-day business by its truly astounding development of commercial arbitration has relieved the courts of a burden under which they were likely to break down. In the same way, by a high order of self-government, it can relieve itself of the need and the incubus of too much governmental interference.

While I think business should be as free and as unharassed and unhampered by government as is possible, I recognize, as you must, that it cannot be entirely free. Human selfishness is too real to permit that. It must always be an obligation of government to keep open the door of opportunity for all on equal terms and prevent the abuse of industrial power. Unfortunately neither statesmen nor economists agree just how to do this. They are still debating whether the anti-trust laws have done more good or more harm; whether some trusts are good and others bad; whether competition is the life of business or the death of it; where regulation helps and where it hurts.

Take this question of big business. A generation ago we were strong to keep all railroads competitive; now we would unite them. Anything that spelled monopoly was anathema; now we recognize that sound economy often justifies monopoly. Big business may be more economical than little business. Enforcing artificial competition may be more costly to the consumer than combination. If big business can increase production at less cost; can localize production in the economically best places; can avoid duplication and waste; utilize by-products; cheapen distribution; balance supply and demand; and establish other advantages claimed for it, then obviously big business should be encouraged for the common good.

The steel industry gives example of some of the greatest of modern combinations. Yet in this field large increases in wages and cost of supplies, as well as the substitution of an eight-hour for a twelve-hour day, have all been absorbed, and prices are nearly back to the pre-war level.

The tariff has doubtless been a factor in our prosperity, but how often is there doubt where economic advantage ends and special privilege begins? Have not some of our infant industries now reached maturity or perhaps senility? How far are subsidies economically sound or unsound?

I think we should look to business men, not to politicians or doctrinaires, to answer all these questions.

The very mess we have had in the Federal Trade Commission and even in the Tariff Commission, when it cannot be persuaded to act as a scientific and non-political body, illustrates how difficult it is to translate economic laws, with all their unforeseen, uncertain and relative factors, into statutes and apply them that way. A high order of business self-government can best find the way out of this economic chaos.

I say economic chaos advisedly. In the last analysis the whole economic equation sums itself up in two factors: production and consumption. One would suppose that the greater our production the greater our prosperity; the more gods, the more wealth; but it all seems to depend on the consumer; if he does not buy we have over-production, and with over-production, prices fall and prosperity halts. Too much wealth apparently results in hard times; we stave this off by high-priced salesmanship, and costly advertising to stimulate the consumer, and we enlarge his purchasing power by devising new and sometimes dangerous credit devices.

The producer thinks he wants prices high, the consumer wants them low. One school says thrift is a great national virtue, another school, as I see in the last Atlantic Monthly, says thrift is an economic peril. We move heaven and earth to capture the foreign markets, and to sell them our surplus; and meanwhile we build a tariff wall to keep out the foreign goods than can pay for it. My point is that business and not government can best lead us out of this wilderness, in fact must lead us out for its own salvation.

With the rapid growth of Federal activity has come a bureaucratic interference with business that I think accounts for much of the current resentment. As if the Internal Revenue Department with its necessary inspectors and accountants were not itself sufficient of a business irritant, there are at least forty other departments and sub-departments and bureaus, not to mention special congressional investigations, which more or less constantly inject themselves into your business, and rarely if ever in a way that is helpful to you. This does not add materially to your joy of living or to your business prosperity. Here again the fault is not in the stars but in yourselves if you do not rectify this.

Is there any justification, for instance, for 300 investigations which a recent writer tells us have been made by the Federal Government since June last year, not because of some emergency demanding them, and not all of them by any means hostile, but simply routine work, conducted at enormous cost by more than 25,000 Federal job-holders?

Government should not forget that the mere fact of an investigation may easily be misunderstood and spell ruin even for a wholesome industry.

Fortunately a new spirit is becoming manifest in the relationship between government and business. The experience of the War Industries Board, among other things, has led many of our industrial leaders to champion the idea that there should be more co-operation and co-ordination in business enterprise, and a helpful rather than a critical attitude on the part of the government. It is encouraging to see associations like yours trying to co-operate and work along these broad lines.

I hope I have made it clear that I am not arguing for freedom of business simply to spare it annoyance, but only because I think business unhampered is a better instrumentality than government, not only to work out its own salvation but also to work out impending social and economic problems. I think high-minded business can meet these with a larger vision and a stronger grasp and a more even justice than can the legislator or the bureaucrat. It can see the problem better from all angles, and can do so because its own self-interest compels.

For example, much governmental interference has come about in an effort to protect the consumer against the producer. In truth business has too much forgotten the consumer; now it begins to see that its main problem is the consumer problem. It is the consumer who pays all the bills, public and private. He makes or unmakes business prosperity. The producer cannot become rich if the consumer becomes poor. The result is that business itself begins to ask why our system of distribution is so costly and so inequitable; why with widespread prosperity reaching from the richest to the poorest, so large a proportion of our wealth nevertheless tends to concentrate in fewer and fewer hands.

Business is beginning to ask whether the consumer is getting a square deal; whether with all our marvelous production, more people ought not to be able to buy more things; whether the cost of distribution is not way out of proportion to the cost of production; whether there is not a dangerous separation between the ownership and the control of wealth; whether the concentration of industrial power is not going too far. And when business once asks these questions and admits the need of an answer, I believe it can give it better than government can.

Finally, let me repeat, if business suffers from too much government, it is itself to blame. It has not developed self-government as it can and should. In old efforts to secure special privileges and what it conceived to be more effective security, it has helped to concentrate power in the Federal Government. I oppose that because I oppose undue concentration and usurpation of power wherever manifest, and because I think Washington cannot frame economic laws that are sure to be sound or self-operating or that can fit the diversified conditions of this diversified country.

The rights of business after all resolve themselves into individual rights; and the Federal Government cannot protect individual liberty or leave the enterprise of men as free and unshackled as it should be if it attempts to deal with all the economic and social problems that are raised by modern business and industry in this huge country. When government goes beyond its scope, human rights suffer and business suffers. Business becomes the victim not only of foolish and unworkable and economically unsound laws, but the victim of bureaucracy with all its red tape and Paul Pryism.

All this puts too big a strain on government. It invites abuse of power. I would relieve this by encouraging more self-government in business and by bringing business into closer touch and harmony with the government both State and National, and especially State. Business, and big business particularly, does not realize the importance to it of our State and Federal system, and of preserving the proper equilibrium.

No one will contend that in the distribution of powers and functions between the States and the Federal Government the fathers of the Republic foresaw even dimly the complexity of the great business era that was to come. They were keen to protect the rights of property, but equally keen to see that wealth as such had no political privileges. They left the protection and the regulation of property rights largely to the States. The interstate operation of business, of course, has made it inevitable and highly desirable that many aspects of it be under Federal control. State interference, where there must be harmony and unity, would be intolerable. Everybody recognizes that.

But has not business, in an effort to protect its security, looked too much to centralized power? Has it not forgotten that the rights of property are political rights and that therefore it behooves it always to strengthen the political structure? If business ignores the States or is indifferent to the political fibre and vitality of the States, it weakens the political foundations on which its whole structure rests. It should therefore work to leave to the States what the States can do better or as well as the central government. The best political, and therefore the best economic, security business can have to-day is to keep political power diversified. An active and belligerent propaganda might stampede a given Congress into passing laws ruinous to business. I believe you can never—at least never again—stampede all the States into doing so.

The relationship between these two great factors in our complex modern life, business and government, interests me profoundly, and yet I am conscious that I have not been able to contribute anything that is new. Yet after all, perhaps a restatement of principles which are not the less enduring because they are simple and elementary, may not be amiss. That is all I have attempted.

So I end by not only advocating the largest possible measure of self-government in business, but also by submitting that the freedom and the stability and the ultimate security of business can best be attained by having a self-governing business encourage and support self-governing States.

By permission of the author.

WELCOME TO THE ASSOCIATED ADVERTISING CLUBS OF THE WORLD

RT. HON. VISCOUNT BURNHAM

Harry Lawson Webster Lawson, created first Viscount Burnham in 1919 for valuable services during the War, has had long experience in public affairs, first as a member of Parliament, and, after the War, as president or chairman of various Empire and international congresses and committees concerned with labor, health, education, and the press. Viscount Burnham was born in London in 1862, and was educated at Eton and Oxford.

This address was made at the convention of the Associated Advertising Clubs of the World in London, 1924.

It is a great pride and pleasure for me to preside over the first session of the biggest rodeo of business and the greatest round-up of business men that has ever yet been held. His Royal Highness the Prince of Wales has honored us by declaring the convention open, and his inauguration of our proceedings is the best send-off that we could have. The Prince is the very incarnation of the spirit of youth, and it is just the imagination of youth that looks at the world with the hope and confidence of those who have not been disillusioned or disappointed of which we stand most in need today. We want to throw off the nightmare of our desolation and go forward with our courage breast high to meet our fate and make good our promise. This is much more than an advertising convention: it is the Rialto of the world's markets.

The Old World, like Doctor Faustus, would almost sell its soul for the renewal of its youth. That is the real meaning of Bolshevism and all the other madnesses which are vexing the mind and conscience of mankind today. Our spirit is depressed but not humbled; our blood pressure is unhealthily high; our powers of resistance and recuperation are unhealthily low. That makes it so important that we should be restored and reinvigorated not by transfusion of blood but by transfusion of hope, not by conversion into one economic system, which is impossible, but by making the least of our differences and the best of our agreements.

You bring here with you from all the four quarters of the globe the powers and the purposes of all the industries and all the trades. Yours is a trade wind that blows everybody good or at least brings everybody's ship to port. It was said in ancient days that eloquence writ large, magnified and multiplied by all the devices of business through all the applications of science. You, the advertisers of the world, speak out with the voice of Stentor, who spoke with a hundred voices, to a world that does not know what it wants and won't be happy till it gets it. The advertising agent is the real interpreter of the felt wants and unfelt wants into the wants that have their outcome in new industries for the employment of capital and labor and fuller opportunities for the happiness of life and the homeliness of the people. You say, and say most truly, that you wish to ring out the false and ring in the true; in fact, to conduct the business of the nations by the golden rules of honesty and honor. That is the opposite of the old conception of deluding the purchasers to buy the goods that were not worth the money. In the Latin play the slave says, "It is necessary to entice the buyer to unsalable wares; good merchandise easily finds a buyer, even though it be hidden away." Today we say that it is only good merchandise that we desire to sell, but the idea still survives among ignorant people and in backward countries that advertising only pays when you want to sell an indifferent article at an exorbitant price. London is the birthplace of modern advertising; Lord Byron in one of his letters wrote that a new slander against him was that he had been paid £50 for writing an advertisement of Day & Martin's Blacking. Lord Byron was a great iconoclast, and never more so than when he said in answer that he wished the charge were true. I was reading in a book written in the 'fifties of the last century about what was called "walking advertisements" in London, in which it was noted as a startling and objectionable innovation that boardmen "out at elbow move in solemn procession along the line of the road" announcing business removals, and that Mr. Bennett, well remembered as Sir John Bennett in the City of London, who sold clocks and watches in Cheapside, paid £900 "for the insertion of his advertisement on the back of the wrapper of the Catalogue of the Great Exhibition of 1851." The writer ends up in mournful numbers that "it is either advertising or being ruined." We say the same thing today in stentorian tones.

Still you hear the echoes of a past age that advertising is an extra charge on the output of industry and the profits of production. Nothing was ever sillier or more fallacious. Advertising is not the driving wheel of the industrial machine, but it is undoubtably its lubricating box, what Edmund Burke called "the lubricator of the fibres" of international trade. It is advertising—call it publicity or propaganda or anything else you like—that is the principal factor in reducing the cost of production by extending it over not so much the widest known area but the widest area that the possibilities of the case allow. "Mass is lord," said George Meredith, and nowhere is this so true as in construction and commerce. Mass production depends on the attenuation of overhead charges and, above all, upon the prevalence of low and even prices of raw material and mechanical power—that is to say, on the cheapness of original values. Long contracts and reasonable prices depend upon both the extensiveness of demand and the intensiveness of demand. The more the markets, and the more carefully those markets are tended, the greater the call for the goods and the steadier the average of the returns. All this is the A. B. C., the Alpha and Omega, of big business, but even in the Parliament houses you hear speeches that betray the most grotesque ignorance of the economic conditions of output and realization in the world's markets. The ideal is that they should be, in the words of an old English charter, "without metes and bounds," and advertising is the best means of attaining that end, so far as private enterprise can prosper as it prospers best, with the minimum of state recognition and assistance. If one listened to the chatter of the platform one would be tempted to imagine that production was everything and distribution nothing and that it mattered not at all how or where a line of goods was marketed so long as it was piled upon a railway siding. There never was a more complete illusion. The merchandising of an article of commerce requires as much special skill and ability as its manufacture. I saw a few days ago that a delegation of Members of Parliament went to view the vast and romantic expanse of Gretna Green, famous for its hedge parsons and runaway marriages in days of yore, and they are about to propose that the derelict machine shops which I saw humming with activity during the World War should again be used to make high explosives for the mines of peace as they did for the mines of war. It sounds so simple and so idyllic. Then comes the stern note of warning from a market master who does not want goods that will be salable, perchance, only at the excessive rates of pampered and sheltered trades, and will have none of them. Unless they can be sold at something over the cost of production, these goods are literally drugs in the market. In any case, they can only be disposed of by the fine art of salesmanship, and salesmanship demands fair prices and sterling values. It is only by creating new markets and restoring old ones that you can establish a higher standard of life and labor. Imagination responds to imagination and there is no truth which is not imaginative. "The artlessness of unadorned truth" is not likely to propagate or to fructify. The promise and potency of advertising depend upon the presentation of the truth, not in the meretricious traffic of sordid dollar hunting, but as the good warranty of service to human needs. One of the greatest of English writers of our day, as well as the greatest of English journalists, the late Lord Morley, used to say "You cannot aim too high." I would only add to that, "You cannot range too far." Nature advertises herself by the cock crow before the dawn and the honey guides which the plants issue to their insect food. The art of propaganda makes the world yield its increase of health and happiness. This convention, which is a true college of propaganda and avows itself as such, is mainly Anglo-American in its constitution, which is not extraordinary, when one considers the undoubted fact that the export trade of the world's commodities is mainly Anglo-American, too. But it is not wholly Anglo-American. The British Dominions over-seas, and especially the great Dominion of Canada, are well represented in our gathering. The allied countries of France, Italy, and Belgium and the friendly countries of Scandinavia, Holland, and Switzerland swell our ranks. We do not in these days "hold the gorgeous East in fee," but we depend largely on Eastern trade, and we are glad to know that India, China, and Japan will increase the opportunities of commercial intercourse by their presence and co-operation. Surely, the power of advertising was never so powerfully illustrated as in this wonderful Parliament of Commerce which demonstrates to the world at large that advertising has become the greatest of all the lines of business. More than five thousand delegates proclaim the fact that advertising is the open secret of sale and distribution without which no trading or industrial community can prosper or continue.

We are met together in the British Empire Exhibition which was obviously intended to be the greatest advertisement of the British Dominions that we have ever had. Here we parade and even flaunt our strength and our resources before the eyes of the trading world. Surely, the holding of this convention here and now is itself the most effective advertisement that advertising can have. It is indeed a moving proof of fellowship and sympathy that America has sent us, with such good will and spontaneity, so large a contingent of her leading citizens and business men, and we accept the compliment in the gracious spirit in which it is paid.

In this vast and various convention we are showing the way to improve and economize the art of living by the use of vision and prevision in helping the community to choose always what is best, what is soundest, and what is fairest, well knowing that in the qualities of fine artistry and good workmanship consist the true values and the highest good, in all the scattered market places of mankind, from pole to pole and from the rising to the setting sun.

By permission of the *Associated Advertising Clubs of the World.*

MEMORIAL ADDRESS

JAMES G. McFARLAND

James G. McFarland, lawyer, of Watertown, South Dakota, was born in Dubuque, Iowa, in 1880; was graduated from the University of Wisconsin; has been city attorney of Watertown, and representative in the State legislature, where he introduced the first mothers' pension bill enacted in the United States.

It was as Past Grand Exalted Ruler of the Benevolent and Protective Order of Elks that he delivered this address at the tomb of President Warren G. Harding, at Marion, Ohio, December 2, 1923.

When the hands of the clock point to the beginning of the last and twelfth hour, and the day is almost done, our sweet Elk chimes ring out with a tender message to the absent—living or dead. Even so, when Time points with solemn finger to the beginning of the last and twelfth month, and the year is almost gone—we of this great Fraternity gather to pay tribute to those who have passed to the great Pasture of Peace, where the grass is always green, where the sun is always bright, and where rest is eternal.

Today, all classes, sects and creeds of true Americans, from all walks of life, meet before our altar and our Country's Flag. More than 850,000 citizens of this great Nation of ours assemble in 1400 and more Lodges, to pay tribute and to glean inspiration from those who have gone before.

As the pages of the book of memory are turned today, and as we look into the record of all these sweet souls, filled with real brotherly love and devotion to home, to this Order and to our Country—one name stands out more prominently than all the rest. One great life was so full of real accomplishment, so active, beautiful and inspiring, that throughout our Order his life and service is held up as a text and an example for all true Elks.

A short three years ago, our Brother, who had learned and felt and practised the great truths of Elkdom during a membership of over thirty years, hurried home from an all too short vacation, to return in time to deliver the Elks Memorial Day Address—not to a great Lodge of the Order—but to give of his best to the less successful brothers resident at our beautiful Elks National Home in the foothills of old Virginia. He recalled the story portraying the character of an incurable invalid who sought contentment in his own heart by seeking out more unfortunate sufferers than himself, and who could not resist the craving to be of some service. Finally, he thought of a confusing fork in the road near his home, which travelers so frequently mistook at night that they often went in the wrong direction. The invalid decided to erect a sign and caused a light to be hung thereon each night, so that all who stopped to read might choose aright. He never knew how many he served, how many futile miles he saved retracing, but in his own breast he was comforted by the consciousness of service rendered, and the light at the fork of the road set aglow a cheering flame in his own existence.

The memory of that beautifully simple address is a treasure in the minds and hearts of all those who heard him that day, and we are fortunate indeed to have the original manuscript of that speech, from which to glean the gems of thought and language. How characteristic of this leader of his people, and of this tender-hearted brother, were his words:

> "Out of memory comes the consciousness of the life worth while, and the compensations of a life of helpfulness to one's fellows. . . . We are met in memory to-day, in grateful, fraternal memory, in behalf of those who have taken the fork of the road of eternal peace.—I never attend a Lodge Memorial without reflecting on the manner I choose to be remembered. We join in this memorial of song and of tribute, but it is the individual memory that goes to the heart.
>
> "Ours is not a memorial of grief. Only happy memories are becoming to the departed; only helpful memories are worth while to the living. If

the departed brethren could know of our memorial, if we could solve the great mystery of mysteries, and know that they knew—we should still attune our memorial above the murmurings of sorrow. For them the book of life has closed, sorrow has had its becoming expression, but normal natural interest is in the living. Indeed, we are met for the living, else this meeting would be in vain. We are met to remind ourselves that as we live, so shall our memories endure. We come to a fresh consciousness to-day that in our daily lives we are making memorials, and it is the privilege of every human being to leave such a memory as he would like to have recalled. Such is the opportunity of the humblest one among us.

"After all, it is the sum total of little things which make a great life. It is not given to all men to inspire great shafts of granite or tablets of bronze, but it is the privilege of every living being to plant an ever blooming friendship in some fellow-breast, and gather all the fruit it bears.

"In the garden of Charity and Fidelity and Justice and Brotherly Love, we may cultivate everything in life worth while. I believe with all my heart we offer highest memorial to-day if we resolve in our hearts to practise faithfully the things that Elkdom preaches, if we magnify the helpful and beautiful memories of the departed, and impress on the living the fraternity which sets hearts aglow with happiness, and turns our songs to praise. This is the sweet assurance for to-day, it is the encouragement for to-morrow, and it answers the call of the heart for those compensations which must come sometime and somewhere in God's eternity of reward."

These illuminating passages from that Memorial Address spell the spirit of his message to the people of the Nation, when he said after his election: "My whole job will be to get the people of the United States together in better understanding!"

This was the keynote of the service of our late President! It should be the lasting lesson of today for all our people.

Just as the union of forces strengthens any cause, so the unified thought and sentiment and action of our cosmopolitan citizenry will bring peace and happiness and further prosperity to our great Nation. Creeds of hate and intolerance can not prevail against a broad American gospel of love and understanding. It was to this end that our late leader took up the burden, and it was with it still in his mind and heart that he wrapped the drapery of a splendid life about him and lay down to pleasant dreams.

As an Order, we may well take heed of this simple American doctrine, and gather further inspiration from the deeds and sacrifices of this, our Brother. It is extremely fitting for us to assemble here in his own home Lodge, Marion No. 32, before our altar with its spreading antlers of protection and brotherly love, with its book of law and justice, and with its beautiful flag of all flags, and look up toward the star of Fidelity, and lift up our hearts in a resolve to profit by the example and the precepts of this big-hearted, broad-minded brother and chieftain.

> "There is but one gift that all our dead desire,
> One gift that man can give, and that's a dream,
> Unless we, too, can burn with that same fire
> Of sacrifice; die to the things that seem;
> Die to the little hatreds, die to the greed,
> Die to the old ignoble selves we knew,
> Die to the base contempts of sect and creed,
> And rise again like these, with souls as true.
>
> "Nay (since these died before their task was finished),
> Attempt new heights! Bring even their dreams to birth!
> Build us that better world, oh, not diminished
> By one true splendor that they planned on earth;
> And that's not done by sword or tongue or pen,
> There is but one way—God make us better men!"

It is entirely fitting that we chisel deep on the tablets of love and memory the virtues and beautiful remembrances of each and all of the brothers whose names have been here called for the last time in our ceremony. But we indeed do but justice to pay affectionate deference to the President of the United States, to the statesman of the people, most especially to the splendid, calm, great man, and to the charitable, just and faithful brother, whose words and deeds bespoke brotherly love—to Warren G. Harding.

May we gather strength and inspiration from this splendid life, and in return resolve to faithfully serve our Country and our beloved Order, so that the light at the fork of the road may set aglow a cheering flame in our own hearts.

His name is written large in the history of our Nation; his influence brought more of real accomplishment in brotherly love between the peoples of this and other countries than any other for generations past;—his will be the brightest among the golden stars in our service Flag—his the first among all the many names upon the honor roll on our memorial tablet!

Not in grief, but, as he wishes it, "above the murmurings of sorrow," let us breathe a prayer and a message: "As the hour of Eleven shall regularly return—to set the bells of memory a-chiming—thou art I and I am thou—for thy name I have as a talisman upon my heart!"

By permission of *The Elks Magazine.*

THE PRESS AND THE GOVERNMENT

IRVINE L. LENROOT

Irvine L. Lenroot, former United States Senator from Wisconsin, was born in Superior, in 1869. His course progressed steadily: stenographer in a law office, then court reporter, lawyer, member of the State Legislature, United States Representative (1909–'18), resigning to accept election to a vacancy in the Senate; re-elected senator for the term 1921–'27.

This address was delivered before the Inland Press Association at Chicago, 1923.

In approaching the consideration of this subject, I would like to have it understood that the observations I shall make are confined to newspapers, papers which would have the public understand that they furnish news to the public as a business, with an implied contract that it will be furnished impartially and without discrimination. They gather the news and sell it to the public and render a valuable public service.

The most important field of news is that relating to the government; for whether we realize it or not, the importance of government overshadows all other activities. Without government there would not be any other business for any length of time. Upon it we depend for the protection of all human and property rights and therefore the relation of the Press to the Government is of prime importance.

If any corroboration were needed of this statement, it is furnished by the fact that the Washington correspondents are the cream of the newspaper writers, and consist of the ablest men in their profession. Too much credit cannot be given to these men. There is no other body of men that I know of who are so high-minded, so genuinely American, so alert, and so able. I do not except the members of the Senate and House of Representatives in making this statement. Indeed, I would frankly say that the leading ninety-six newspaper correspondents in Washington are much better qualified to be United States Senators than are the present incumbents. They are informed upon every public question, quick in judgment, resourceful in getting and weighing news, and never betray a confidence.

As an example of their alertness, a little over a year ago President Harding sent word that he would like to meet three Senators at the White House at six o'clock that evening, that he wished to avoid publicity of the meeting and asked them to come singly and enter from the opposite end from where the correspondents were stationed. I was one of the three and we followed instructions, being extremely careful that no one whom we knew see us enter. The Conference lasted for an hour and a half, and as we were having an evening session of the Senate we returned there singly and as carefully as we had come. Upon my entering the Chamber an Associated Press correspondent came to my desk and said, "Senator, can you tell us anything about the conference you and Senators—naming them—have just had at the White House?" Another illustration: There was an important conference one evening at the home of Senator Lodge attended by about a dozen Senators. When it broke up, it was agreed that nothing should be given out to the newspapers concerning it. Later in the evening I was called on the 'phone by one of the correspondents, who stated that he had been told that there was to be nothing given to the Press, and would not ask me to state what it was about, but would like to ask me a simple question that could be answered by yes or no—and stated it. I saw no possible harm in answering,—for standing alone, it could give him no information,—and I did so. But the next morning there was a very complete story of the meeting, and we afterwards found that each Senator present had been asked but one question; but no two questions were alike, and like myself the other Senators had answered, and when all the questions and answers were studied together, the correspondent had the story.

We have found in Washington the best way to keep a secret is to tell it to a newspaper correspondent in confidence. Very often he will refuse to hear it at all in that way, saying of course he then could not use it and would rather take his chances in getting the information in some other way.

I have never known a correspondent who would use any information which he might gain if he believed it would injure his country. This was especially marked during the war, and many sensational stories never were written because of the belief that they might be of value to our enemies if published.

I have but one fault to find with correspondents at Washington, and that is the voluminous space given to the petty things which sometimes occur on the floor of the Senate, and the brief space often given to the solid constructive work of that body. Let some Senator call another a liar, and a column is written in feverish haste describing the occurrence; but let there be solid debate upon some great constructive measure affecting the entire nation, and it frequently gets a paragraph or nothing at all. But I have found that the correspondents are not to blame for this, but the publishers themselves. At one time when a Senator was making a wonderful argument upon a certain measure of great importance, I said to a correspondent, "That's a great speech the Senator is delivering, and the Country ought to get the points he is making. How much of a story are you going to give it?" "Oh," he said, "I know that's an important speech, and I would like to write a story on it, but if I did, my paper wouldn't publish it. They say our readers don't care for such solid stuff." And this brings me to a point that I would like to make some observations upon.

When we compare the British Press with our own, the first thing that attracts our attention is the greater importance given by them to the serious news of the day, especially relating to matters of government, and sensational news regarding individuals is given a minor place. With us, a murder, an elopement, a scandal gets screaming head lines, and the news of really national importance is usually given second place. I have talked with many publishers concerning this, and the answer always is, "We give to our readers what they want; and if we don't do it, they would buy some other paper that does." I see the force of this position, but it is unfortunate for the country that it is so, and it does not speak well for the taste of our people. But I believe this attitude of the public is exaggerated, for some of our most successful newspapers do not give the sensational scandals of the day first place. I believe that it is a mistake for papers in our smaller cities to ever follow the example of the sensational Press of our large cities, and it seems to me that, where there are only two daily papers in a city, the publishers of both could easily agree upon a policy that would eliminate from their pages such news outside of their own locality. If some one in New York City runs away with another man's wife, none of the parties probably ever having been heard of by the readers of the paper, why should space be given it, crowding out news that might take its place, of informing value to the public, news concerning our foreign relations and our domestic policies of government.

One of the greatest dangers confronting America today is that our people are not informed upon public questions, that they do not understand the facts underlying our problems. Now there is never any politics in a fact. There cannot be, because there can never be a difference of opinion about a fact. It is only as to conclusions to be drawn from a fact, that politics or differences of opinion can enter in. So with regard to public questions, newspapers should freely state the facts about them and leave to the editorial columns any conclusions to be drawn from the facts. A newspaper which will in the news columns either suppress or distort facts because of the political complexion of the paper is not a newspaper at all, and in selling its papers obtains money under false pretenses. There are very few newspapers that are guilty of this, but unfortunately there is a widespread belief that people cannot believe what they read in the papers. It is of the greatest importance to the Press as well as the public that such care shall be taken in publishing the news that where a thing is stated as a fact it can be relied upon.

There is also room for improvement in another direction, and that is the form of criticism of the President of the United States, whoever he may be. Since the death of President Harding, I hope the Press and the Public have learned one thing, and that is, that however much we may disagree with the policies or views of the President, he shall not be charged with sinister motives against the people of the Country whom he was elected to serve. We have had partisan papers in both parties which have in the past most unjustly impugned the motives of the President. We have never had a President in my recollection, Republican or Democratic, who did not in my opinion honestly seek to serve the best interests of the people of our country. There is room enough for honest criticism of policies, without making the outrageous and unjust charge that a President would knowingly serve any interest to the injury of our people.

We hear much today about the "Kept Press." From a careful observation of the Press of the Country, I have come to the conclusion that there is such a thing as a "Kept Press," but it is confined almost wholly to those papers who make that charge. The Press of the Country as a whole is independent, and its news columns have no connection with the Advertising Department. On the other hand, nearly every paper making this charge is "Kept" by some organization political or otherwise, its news columns reflecting the opinions of those who own stock in it or contribute to its deficits. They are counterfeit newspapers, and the whole purpose of their existence is propaganda of one sort or another. They are responsible in a very large degree for the failure of the public to understand the facts about public questions. They do not hesitate to use their news columns to misstate and distort facts, and they charge other papers which do state them with being "Kept" by some special interest, with the result that the public does not know what to believe. A newspaper which is found guilty of misstating facts in its news columns, for the purpose of serving some propaganda, ought to be ostracised by respectable newspaper publishers and barred from membership in their associations.

There is no business, no profession which renders as much free service to the Government as the Press. The Government, like charitable associations, expects to get advertising from the newspapers as a gift—and this is most unjust to the newspapers. Publicity of Government activity is of two kinds. One relating to general affairs of the Government, in which all the people should be interested, and this is news, which the subscriber and advertiser pay for gathering. It is a part of the business of a newspaper to publish this, and there is no private relationship whatever between the newspaper and the Government in doing so. But there is another kind of Government publicity that is simply advertising, and yet the newspapers are expected to publish it free. If the Government wants job printing done, it pays for it; if it requires stationery, it pays for it. It pays for everything it needs except advertising. To illustrate: Notice of a Civil Service examination is sent to a newspaper. This may interest at most a dozen individuals in the community or a few hundred in a State. This is not news; it is advertising, and a newspaper should not be asked to publish it free. I might go on and name many other Government activities where material is prepared at great cost at Washington and sent to the newspapers, with the request to publish it free. It is now generally recognized that advertising is a commodity and should be purchased for what it is worth in the same way as lumber or steel, or merchandise. Why should the greatest business institution in our Country, the Government, fail to recognize it as such? I think one answer is the difficulty of establishing a practical plan of Government advertising. For one thing there is a twilight zone between Government news and Government advertising, and it is very difficult to fix the exact boundaries of each. The next difficulty is that while the United States is the greatest business corporation in the Country it is not run with the same independence and efficiency as a private business. Political considerations have a great deal to do with the business of the Government, and there is danger that a large advertising fund might be used not upon a business basis, but a political basis. To illustrate: If there are two newspapers in a town, one morning and the other evening, having practically the same readers, it would hardly be good business for a corporation in New York to advertise the same thing in both of them, and he would select one of them. But with Government advertising, if they were both Republican papers, when the Republican party was in power the life of a Senator and of the Congressman of the District would be more miserable than it is if they both did not get the advertising, if it is to be paid for. The same would be true of course of Democratic papers, if that party should ever get into power. Then again, objection would be made to the cost; and it might be said, if the papers will not publish Government copy without being paid for it, they need not publish it at all.

I realize the difficulties in the way of doing justice to the newspapers; and yet I believe there are some things which the Government could do, without great cost to itself, and yet recognize in a substantial way the value of newspaper advertising. For the Government to advertise any activity that applies to the whole country or any substantial portion of it may not be practical for the reasons I have given and others; but it seems to me that it would be entirely practical for the Government to advertise and pay for any activity which is confined to a community or a section of a state, and which is not a matter of news.

This would include Civil Service examinations for postmasters and some other Civil Service activities, and there are no doubt many other government activities which would come under this classification.

The cost would not be great, but it would recognize the right principle, that advertising is a commodity and ought to be paid for by the Government as well as by private individuals. Then there should be a curtailment of the material sent by the Government to the newspapers with the expectation that it will be published free. Only such material should be so sent that has a news value. This alone would effect a substantial saving in the

Government printing bill, which I am informed amounts to eleven million dollars annually, and this saving would go far to meet the advertising expense which I have suggested.

I have ventured to touch upon this problem because I have felt that the existing practice works a great injustice upon the newspapers, and if some practical solution can be found to correct in part at least, the injustice, I shall be glad to give it my support.

In conclusion, the Press is the medium between the people and their Government. It brings to them information of what the Government is doing, of its policies and activities; and it brings to the officials of the Government, to a very large degree, the sentiments and views of the people. In this country the people are sovereign; and before their opinion, intelligently and deliberately formed, all government officials, responsible to the people, must bow. For that intelligent deliberately formed opinion, without which no government can long endure, we must depend upon the Press more than any other agency. As it has been high-minded, independent, and patriotic in the past, so may it continue to be in the future. With such a Press, America will continue to grow in all those things which really make a nation great.

By permission of the author.

THE SALESMAN AS A COLLECTOR

HENRY A. JEFFRIES

Henry A. Jeffries, identified with Kingan and Company of Indianapolis, delivered this address at the annual sales meeting of the company in Indianapolis, 1924.

I CONSIDER it a privilege, as it is a pleasure, after the lapse of nearly two years again to appear before the "Big Meeting."

It is difficult for me, after having addressed you three times in the past four years, to say anything that was not included in those talks, or that is not more or less commonplace to those of you who have had years of experience in making collections.

At this time I shall try to discuss the subject assigned to me in a more general way than before, hoping that there will be something said that will at least repay your attention.

As to those collections that you make without any special effort, nothing need be said. Just here however, at the outset, I wonder how many of you first get the money for goods already sold, the bills for which are due or overdue, before taking another order.

I remember talking some years ago with one of the best salesmen we ever had, and one who made very few bad accounts. He said that he always made it a point to present the statement to the customer before soliciting his order. He had his trade accustomed to this procedure, and you can readily see the propriety of it. If the customer is not going to pay his bills then due, it gives the salesman a distinct advantage, as he may not want to accept an order from him under such a condition; but of course circumstances alter cases.

It is not policy to refuse to take an order just because the dealer may skip a payment. His past reputation with the House must be considered in such an instance before he is turned down —you do not want to lose a good customer, neither does the House, and you know that frequently there is Tommy Armour, Henry Swift or Jimmy Wilson only waiting for a chance to take him on. Let me say right here, that to sell a man just because some competitor is selling him, is often the stepping stone to a loss. There should be other and fundamental qualifications for credit before he is sold anything on time.

It is well known that when a business fails it is usually owing a number of concerns, and it is often puzzling to see how it could keep going so long under such a load of debt.

It is not always the slow pay debtor who fails, either. Some debtors when they fail are found to have been quite prompt with at least a portion of their creditors.

You all know how discouraging it is to have a customer put you off when he is presented with a statement of his account, especially if he is weak financially. You want to take his order, for tonnage must be kept at normal, but at the same time you fear he is on the brink of failure, and you don't want to make a loss for the House and an increase in your percentage of bad debts.

When you no longer take orders from a delinquent debtor, it often means that you will have to collect what he owes on the installment plan, and in many instances he never pays out, especially when he retires from business. Some debtors in this condition promise to pay all they owe in the near future, but are unwilling to make small payments at regular intervals on the plea that they are unable to do so. This is where the battle of wits takes place between the delinquent and the salesman, and lucky is the latter when he gets his man to promise to pay at stated times and to keep it up. There is one case now on our books where a man owes us about $50.00, but says he has nothing to give us when the salesman who calls on him asks him for money. His store has only a few goods in it and the collection looks hopeless. When a man with such a stock of goods gets in this condition, one wonders how he ever paid his bills when he seemed more prosperous.

Too many small merchants have no idea of what they are making or losing. What with selling too cheaply and not being able to collect enough of their accounts to keep their own bills paid up, sooner or later they find themselves swamped, having lost all their capital.

It is hard to refuse to sell a merchant who has been a good buyer, having most of the time paid his bills promptly. Of course such a one is deserving of some special consideration. It must not be forgotten, that during a long period of dealing, he has been a source of profit to the House, and though business is not a charitable institution, yet as far as possible such a debtor is entitled to leniency on the part of his creditor to the extent that all the circumstances will permit. He may change his attitude toward your efforts to collect, and then is the time to change your tactics toward him if by so doing it will give you promise of any favorable results. It must be remembered that there are other salesmen who want their money as well as you, and it is a maxim of equity that "fortune favors the diligent." This was particularly true before the days of the bankruptcy act.

When a customer gets too slow and yet expects to buy freely, he should be asked for security, especially when he owes a large account. What may be termed "a large account" depends on the rating he has, and the extent of his assets as they appear or may be known to exist. Fifty dollars might be a large sum for some merchants to owe, while five hundred dollars would hardly be so considered if due from others.

You cannot have too much information about your trade, either favorable or unfavorable, and, as a rule, it is more important to know what is unfavorable than otherwise. In making sales the main thing is to be assured that the buyer's implied promise to pay is based on his potential ability and desire to do so. It is the lack of such information that makes credit granting more or less risky. Every little bit of knowledge you have or may acquire of the people you sell to has its bearing on your being able to collect for the goods you sell, and this information should be imparted to the House when it reaches you. A customer's habits, for example, have a most important bearing on his credit standing; not infrequently they are the cause of his financial downfall. When you know a customer is subject to criticism in this respect, the fact should be promptly reported to headquarters. Drinking, gambling and immorality are the principal things to be considered in this connection; extravagant living is another thing that may produce insolvency, also it may be caused by domestic troubles. It is not always easy to get such information, but one can compare notes with other salesmen, or make inquiry of neighborhood competitors where it is possible and proper to do so. A salesman gets on terms of intimacy with his trade more or less, and this relationship is valuable in different ways.

Salesmen should be able to advise with their customers about business matters. Many a merchant has been benefited by taking a salesman's advice, and so is enabled to pay his bills more promptly than otherwise. Not long ago a prominent grocer in an Ohio city, who had let a check go to protest for the first time, asked for advice about changing his business from credit to cash, because of his having so many slow-pay customers. He said his present system was detrimental to him in that he was pinched at times for ready cash with which to meet his own obligations. As he was talking over the long distance, I told him we would have our salesman speak to him about the matter. I never heard anything more from him. If the salesman had any conversation with this man on the subject, and you are interested, I believe he would be glad to tell you what was said if you will indicate your desire to hear it.

A road salesman needs to know a lot more than merely to sell goods. He ought to know about credits and collections as well. He ought to learn all he can about commercial law, especially the law of contracts, and the collateral subject of negotiable instruments, which includes notes, checks and drafts. He ought to be a keen student of nature and thus strengthen his intuition, enabling him more or less to read a man's face as to whether he is honest in his intentions or not. But when you get well acquainted with a customer, you can judge his principles by your contact with him. A man of good business ability and right principles can get all the help he needs financially. You will remember that J. P. Morgan I, when questioned by a congressional committee, said emphatically he would lend one million dollars to such a man before he would to another who had capital and capacity but lacked character. "The three C's" make a powerful combination, but the greatest of these is character.

It has often been said, a bill well sold is half collected, but I should say it is more than half collected. This is why the selling of goods is so intimately connected with the collecting for them, and is my excuse for linking the two things so closely together.

What is needed to keep down the bad debt loss is more and better information on the buyer, and an intelligent application of same to the case at hand. If you knew more about some of your trade you would try to sell them more freely; as to others you would lose no time in getting the money and closing the account.

By permission of the author.

THE WAY OUT FOR NEW ENGLAND

EDWARD A. FILENE

Edward A. Filene, president of William Filene's Sons Company, of Boston, Massachusetts, was born in Salem, Massachusetts, in 1860, and has long been identified with civic and industrial progress. He has acted in many official and advisory capacities—as instance, director, Boston Chamber of Commerce; councillor, Chamber of Commerce of the United States; director, International Chamber of Commerce; chairman, Industrial Relations Committee.

This address was delivered before the fifth annual convention of the New England Advertising Clubs, at Hartford, Connecticut, November, 1924. As president of one of New England's largest department stores, Mr. Filene was listened to with great eagerness.

New England is proud of her past. And justly so. For not only have Yankee resource, industry and courage given New England a pre-eminent position in America throughout the greater part of the last 300 years, but New Englanders, by the same qualities that made New England great, have taken the lead in the development of the whole nation.

The civilization that is America's today is to a very important extent the result of New England pioneering. New England enterprise, using wealth created by New England brains, built the cities of the West and tied them together with transcontinental railways. New England ideals have dotted the land with schoolhouses and great universities.

Such is the greatness of New England's past. As a native of New England, of course I gladly join in honoring this New England of history. But I am more concerned with the New England of today and tomorrow. I am not among those who feel that, having made her great contribution, New England is now doomed to watch the national advance from a quiet place in a corner.

I firmly believe that the New England of tomorrow has not merely as big a part to play in the life of America as the New England of yesterday, but that it is her destiny to play an even bigger part. And I make that confident prediction, not as a bubbling optimist, but as a New England business man more actively engaged in business than ever before—who has made a life study of the hard facts of business opportunity in our part of America. I base my prophecy on my intimate knowledge of the vast resources and the great natural advantages of New England for commercial supremacy.

New England has the wealth, the experience and training, the education through unsurpassed schools and colleges, the power of consumption, the railroad facilities, the skilled labor, the native intelligence, the unrivaled sea-front and the proven industrial capacity to promise a future even greater than the past.

Yet New England lags. New England's leaders admit it. They seek to help with such demonstrations as New England Week has provided, demonstrations which I fear are of little effect toward the end in view, because too often they are not symptoms of advance but rather denials of failure to advance as swiftly as we are entitled to.

New England is too rich in resources to have to depend on local patriotism for the purchase of her products. New England's ability to produce and sell her products, not only to New England, but to the world, depends essentially on her ability to meet and beat competition. In fact, local patriotism, in so far as it encourages our people to buy, and therefore manufacturers to make goods for any other reason than that they are competitively superior, hurts rather than helps New England.

Why is New England, which is so abundantly endowed for industrial progress, not advancing as rapidly as formerly? New England today has good men and good goods. But New England is no longer dominant in American industry. "Made in New England" is not the hall mark it once was.

What has happened and is happening to New England is the same thing that has happened to many of the most successful businesses. There are innumerable instances of enterprises, which, having attained great success through constant initiative and business courage, thereupon deified the methods and machinery of their past success, forgetting that that success was won through fearless initiative and rapid adaptation to changing times.

What is happening is the same thing that has happened to most of the nationally advertised products of a generation ago. The older men among you will recall, as I do, trade names that were household words some years ago but are no longer heard. And it was not lack of advertising that put them down and out, but inability to compete. They did not keep up with new conditions, did not continue to use the enterprise and initiative that had made them successful.

That, I think, tells what ails New England. An expert told me recently that New England suffers from failing to keep her machinery up to date. More important than modern machinery is up-to-date organization. New England must keep up to or ahead of her competitors in methods of production and distribution.

What is called for in New England is that the manufacturers, the chambers of commerce, the real estate men, the transportation men and you advertising men get together and make definite plans to reorganize New England business on a basis of mass production and mass distribution. It is a big order. But it will pay.

Business must be brought together in consolidation and trusts. In the future business has got to be bigger than it is now to be as successful as it must be to survive. People have got to revise their ideas of big business. European industry, as a result of the war, and facing the prospect of super-competition in the markets of the world, is more and more taking the direction of great trūsts organized to standardize production and to reduce every process of production and distribution to the finest point of efficiency. Our New England industries must compete with these great foreign trusts in the world's markets. Mass production is coming in every country. Mass production is only possible through big business. So the public must realize that big business is an improved machine. It will be an important service of advertising to educate the public to this vital principle.

Big business is not bad in itself. It may have bad spots in this its pioneer stage. But it is incomparably better and more practical than the alternatives proposed, namely socialism and communism. If we are to have big wages, we shall have to help big business to work within the law. We do not want to be in the same position as the people at the beginning of the machine age who destroyed new and better machinery when it put them out of work. The analogy is perfect, though some of us may not believe it. We have been trying to destroy the machinery of big business because in some cases it has been misused.

If New England is to be more successful in the future, it has got to use this new machinery of big business and see that it is helped to work within the law. No business, big or little, has any right to profit except through service. Business, to be good business must be conducted as public service. If it is a service, the bigger it is the better service it can render—the more legitimate profit it can make.

Those of us who fear mass production can remember that it reverses the process that held in the pioneer stage of industry. Pioneer business put prices as high as it could and held wages as low as possible. Mass production will, out of self interest, set the price as low as possible, so it can get mass selling. And it will pay as high wages as it can to create mass buying. Mass consumption is possible only when the masses earn good wages. Ford has paid double wages.

I have just received from my publisher the first copies of my new book, "The Way Out." In it I have described this period we are entering as the Second Industrial Revolution. We are already well into its first stages. The first industrial revolution was the substitution of machine work for hand work. Industrial production, despite its marvellous achievements, is just now emerging from its pioneer stage. The next stage, I have described in a chapter of "The Way Out" under the title "Fordizing America."

I coined this word, "Fordizing," to picture in the simplest way what is about to happen. We are entering the era of mass production and mass distribution, along the road that Mr. Ford has pointed out so successfully.

Mr. Ford has produced the best and cheapest article of its kind, at the same time paying the highest wages ever paid for like work. And he has made by it the greatest fortune any producer ever made, perhaps the greatest fortune in all history.

He has done it by creating new methods of production. He has done it by recognizing the real reason why the ordinary costs of production are so high—that is because methods and machinery are not adapted to real mass production, and because waste is so great. The Commission on Elimination of Waste in Industry, appointed by the Federated American Engineering Societies, reported to Mr. Hoover that waste is one-half the cost of production.

Mr. Ford has seen the necessity of uniting the production and transportation of his raw materials from the producer to the consumer, so that his work cannot be held up by any one link in the chain of production. In doing this he has eliminated one of the greatest sources of waste—one of the greatest causes of high cost of production. He owns the mines that produce his coal and the mines that yield his metals. He has his own mills to produce his glass and his cotton. He even tans his own leather. And what is most remarkable, he owns his own railroad, which connects with many of the trunk lines; so it is possible for him to obtain fair rate treatment, and avoid delays due to any one railroad.

The Ford organization is a vertical trust and a most beneficial trust, because Mr. Ford has understood and maintained the principle of vast production and low per piece profits. He says:

> "My policy is to reduce the price, extend the operations and improve the article. You will notice that the reduction of price comes first. I have never considered any costs as fixed. Therefore I first reduce the price to a point where I believe more sales will result. Then we go ahead and try to make the price. I do not bother about the costs. The new

price forces the costs down. . . . One of the ways of discovering what a cost ought to be is to name a price so low as to force everybody in the plant to the highest point of efficiency. The low price makes everybody dig for profits. I can make more discoveries concerning manufacturing and selling under this forced method than by any method of leisurely investigation."

That is the road that New England is better fitted than any other part of the country, I think, to follow. The opportunity for mass production in New England is enormous. The shoe industry offers an illustration of the pressing need for "Fordizing" New England business. In the past New England dominated the shoe production of the country and built up shoe cities like Brockton, Haverhill and Lynn. Now the New England shoe business is unprofitable. Production is not over 50 per cent of capacity. Many firms have failed. The future of shoe manufacturing in New England under the present method is, to say the least, extremely uncertain.

At the same time it is reported that Endicott-Johnson in New York and the International Shoe Corporation in St. Louis, which have effected mass production in shoes, are prospering. "Fordizing" in fact is applicable to all the chief necessities of life.

It is plain that mass production is dependent on mass selling. Here is where advertising comes into the picture of the "Fordized" New England. Big advertising depends on mass distribution. The units of distribution must be large enough to afford advertising. This means not large units only, but also chains of smaller units. I pointed out in my public addresses and writings some years ago that chain stores could and would advertise. Now the "Atlantic and Pacific" is using full page space.

Consolidated bakeries, Ward's for example, are other new advertising customers you owe to the "Fordizing" of industry. As businesses are aggregated, they can and will and must advertise on a large scale, whereas their units found it impossible to advertise. And this advertising is not, as some people declare, an economic waste. It is a benefit to society.

We have considered mass production and mass distribution in the future of New England industry. Transportation is a vital factor in New England's capacity for mass production and mass distribution. New England has to import most of its raw materials and to ship out an important part of its finished goods. Railroad rates have not been favorable to the advance of New England industry. But we have the ocean at our door. Our seafront is one of our chief assets.

We are nearer two-thirds of the buying population of the United States by water, than are the big inland producing cities by rail. Nearness is measured almost wholly by cost of transportation. Sea rates are so much cheaper that we can reach the principal Pacific coast cities at a lower cost than the rail rates of cities half way to the Pacific. More than that, we can ship by water to any port of our country and then send our goods far inland, before our transportation bill equals the all-rail charges against the central cities.

Through the Panama Canal we can reach San Francisco, Seattle, Europe, South America and the Orient considerably cheaper and quicker than Chicago can—time is money. But of course nothing short of mass standardized production will continuously furnish cargoes of properly priced goods to do it. Present individualistic production cannot do it permanently and successfully.

If we succeed in mass production there is little reason why we should not, even in the super-competition we shall meet, export our surplus to prevent that over-competition in the United States that nullifies profits and brings great political and social danger from unemployment.

As New England industry is forced to meet world competition, the development of free ports is inevitable. In European countries some of the richest cities have been free ports. Hamburg is a familiar example. A free port allows the importation and storage of goods in zones where they can be manufactured, stored until needed in this country, or exported free of duty. Goods can be made cheaply for export in free ports. Manufacturing zones along the water front will produce commodities for export without the payment of duties on their raw materials.

In the "Fordized" New England, factories will be built on the waterfront. On one side of the factory boats will bring raw materials and take away a good portion of the finished product, to be delivered in United States ports, in South America, and in other world markets. On the other side of the factory, freight cars will load from the door of the shipping room and save all the intermediate handling charges.

Another great advantage for mass production lies in New England's wasted water power. Water power is perhaps New England's greatest physical asset. The power of the rivers and streams of these six states, if harnessed to turn our industries will give us, combined with our other advantages, the lead in production and distribution.

New England does not use half its water power. Let me cite Mr. Ford again. He is scattering the plants that make his auto parts along the streams back among the farms where they offer part time employment to farmers and their families between harvest and planting time. "One could put a small plant on a little stream," Mr. Ford says, "and a combination of little plants, each making a single part, will make the whole cheaper than a vast factory would."

A thoroughly developed super-power system in New England would save 12,000,000 tons of coal a year. A "Fordized" New England production of shoes will not pay speculatively increased prices for coal. With the aid of New England streams, the "Fordized" shoe business will not only manufacture shoes; it will produce its own leather from hides secured wherever they can be produced or bought cheapest.

A "Fordized" New England will apply its unbounded educational resources to the manufacture of new lines of goods. New England still leads in the production of many of the intricate tools of industry. She can count on the skill and genius of her craftsmen. With the great advantage over other parts of America in the number and prestige of her technical schools and universities, libraries and museums of art and science, New England has an opportunity to produce a type of commodity which receives the greater part of its value from applied art and science, and only a lesser part from the raw materials that must be transported from other regions. New England's art products might come to have the same reputation as French products have. Plainly the advertiser has a part to play in this kind of development.

Advertising, in the new order, must assume new and heavier responsibilities. The changes to mass production and mass distribution can be made most rapidly through big advertising. The great profits of mass production and mass distribution will go almost wholly to big advertisers and big advertising, provided it is done truthfully and efficiently. Advertising must take a firmer, more valuable place as a necessary power in our economic system. Advertising will be used to further the cause of business as a service. It will be the principal medium for the broadcasting of facts. It will not only describe goods. It will also describe advance methods and processes to prove their worth to the public.

I think it is most essential that the advertising men of this country study still more carefully the coming "Fordization" of all necessities of life. I am sure that the only danger that threatens the success of our New England industries is the possible failure of the majority of our manufacturers, advertisers, business men and labor leaders to anticipate and prepare for the radical changes in the world's systems and methods of production and distribution that are now upon us. The future prosperity of New England will depend largely upon the extent to which these changes are anticipated and promptly met.

I am a believer in New England men and women. I am a believer in New England's future. I am yours for a "Fordized" New England.

By permission of the author.

ACCEPTANCE OF THE PRESIDENCY OF THE AMERICAN FEDERATION OF LABOR

WILLIAM GREEN

William Green, president of the American Federation of Labor, came to be a national figure after many years in industry and politics in his native Ohio (he was born in Coshocton, 1873). He had been successively a district president of the United Mine Workers of America; State senator, delegate at large to the Democratic National Convention, 1912; international secretary-treasurer of the United Mine Workers of America; vice-president, and member of the Executive Council, American Federation of Labor.

This speech was delivered to members of the Council of the A. F. of L., at its Forty-fifth Annual Convention at Atlantic City, December 20, 1924, when Mr. Green assumed the presidency, following the death of Samuel Gompers.

I WOULD not be human if I failed to appreciate in full measure this manifestation of your confidence, your friendship and your good will. I am not insensible to the most friendly and complimentary sentiments expressed by my friend President Lewis who so eloquently placed my name before this convention. And following that, this unanimous vote of the convention so generously and enthusiastically given, all touches me very, very deeply. Whatever may be my fortune in the future, whatever may be my experience in the days that are to come, I shall never forget this occasion and I shall cherish within my memory this manifestation of your friendship and good will.

I do not mind confessing to you that when I accepted the standard and banner of trade unionism, of leadership in this movement, when it fell from the palsied hands of our great leader, it was one of the most momentous moments of my life. When I considered the high standard of excellency and service which had been set by a man who had led for fifty years, with all the influence that went with that long, long line of service, with the wise counsel and judgment and courage given and shown by this great leader, I realized fully that it was a tremendous reponsibility which I was called upon to assume. I wondered whether or not the judgment of my colleagues on the Council was properly placed, whether or not they had erred in their decision, because I fully appreciated the task I was assuming and the responsibility which came to me, but I resolved within my heart and mind that, come what may, so help me Providence, I would give the work the best that was within me.

I resolved this for two reasons. First, because I wished and yearned to carry on for the great hosts of labor, to serve as best I could; and secondly, I wanted to vindicate the judgment of my colleagues. And now it has come. I believe you have registered approval of the judgment of my colleagues, and because you have approved their action I am happy.

The greatest opportunity that comes to us is to serve, serve our fellow men, serve unselfishly as opportunity presents itself. What is there in life that brings such satisfaction and such great reward as service? Not service of a grudging kind, not service that finds its inspiration in the selfish motives of the human heart, not the sort of service that springs from a desire and promote one's material interest, but a service that springs out of a desire to serve and to help your fellow men.

And so I accept your commission today, happily accept it, and with it and in return for the commission which you have transmitted to me I pledge to you all that I am. Here is my life, my body, my brain, my mind and my service in your cause.

By permission of the author.

PART II

Written papers delivered by a great personality and interesting because spoken or read by that person.

BOB DAVIS RECALLS

WHEN JOB HEDGES UNEARTHED A SPEECH FOR ALL OCCASIONS

Robert H. Davis, noted editor, dramatist, and sportsman, was born in Brownsville, Nebraska, March 23, 1869. He was the founder and editor of many periodicals and the author of many books and plays. His daily column entitled "Bob Davis Recalls," in the New York Sun, has made his name known widely. For his interview with Mussolini, Rome, Sept. 13, 1926, after the fourth attempt upon the Premier's life, Mr. Davis was made an honorary life member of the staff of the Associated Press. The "Speech for All Occasions," as quoted here, is inserted because it is unique of its kind. It appeared in Mr. Davis' column in the New York Sun, March 22, 1927.

AMONG the numerous after-dinner speakers famous in New York during the last twenty years the late Job Hedges stands out with singular brilliance. He was endowed with a fine elocutionary gift that enabled him to present his rare wit, wisdom and philosophy with a delicacy and power that gave charm and depth to his utterances.

During the whole competitive era in which he reigned none of his contemporaries wagged a more eloquent tongue or addressed himself with more humor to the subject in hand. He was grave or gay as the theme demanded, blending gayety with pathos and fact with fancy. In metaphor and epigram he was unrivaled. All of his speeches were buttressed with common sense. Fortunate indeed the dinner chairman who could say to the guests: "We have with us to-night Job E. Hedges."

* * *

In 1924 I called upon him at his office to discuss the subject of his proposed memoirs. One of his numerous political acquaintances dropped in and announced his intention of delivering a speech at a district gathering.

"What I want," said he to the master spellbinder, "is something more or less general that will fit any occasion; one of those knockout talks with some language in it; the more language the better. Gimme an idea."

Job's eye twinkled. "I've got the very thing right here in my desk. It was written by my friend, A. Parker Nevin of Princeton University. You can call it 'The Crisis,' 'Justice,' 'Solution,' 'Destiny,' or anything you want. It covers the whole range of human thought and is unanswerable. Sit down, and I'll read it aloud. I consider it a masterpiece. Now get this."

Thereupon Job read in his best manner and with skillful pauses the following Nevin knockout:

"Mr. Chairman, Ladies and Gentlemen: It is indeed a great and undeserved privilege to address such an audience as I see before me. At no previous time in the history of human civilization have greater problems confronted and challenged the ingenuity of man's intellect than now. Let us look around us. What do we see on the horizon? What forces are at work? Whither are we drifting? Under what mist of clouds does the future stand obscured? My friends, casting aside the raiment of all human speech, the crucial test for the solution of all these intricate problems to which I have just alluded is the sheer and forceful application of those immutable laws which down the corridor of Time have always guided the hand of man, groping, as it were, for some faint beacon light for his hopes and aspirations. Without these great vital principles we are but puppets responding to whim and fancy, failing entirely to grasp the hidden meaning of it all. We must readdress ourselves to these questions which press for answer and solution. The issue cannot be avoided. There they stand. It is upon you—and you—and yet even upon me that the yoke of responsibility falls.

"What, then, is our duty? Shall we continue to drift? No! With all the emphasis of my being I hurl back the message No! Drifting must stop. We must press onward and upward toward the ultimate good to which all must aspire. But I cannot conclude my remarks, dear friends, without touching briefly upon a subject which I know is steeped in your very consciousness. I refer to that spirit which gleams from the eyes of a new-born babe; that animates the toiling masses; that sways all the hosts of humanity past and present. Without this energizing principle all commerce, trade and industry are hushed and will perish from this earth as surely as the crimson sunset follows the golden sunshine. Mark you, I do not seek to unduly alarm or distress the mothers, fathers, sons and daughters gathered before me in this vast assemblage, but I would indeed be recreant to a high resolve which I made as a youth if I did not at this time and in this place and with the full realizing sense of responsibility which I assume publicly declare and affirm my dedication and my concentration to the eternal principles and receipts of simple, ordinary, commonplace JUSTICE.

"For what, in the last analysis, is justice? Whence does it come? Where does it go? Is it tangible? It is not. Is it ponderable? It is not. Justice is none of these, and yet, on the other hand, in a sense it is all of these things combined. While I cannot tell you what justice is, this much I can tell you: That without the encircling arms of justice, without her shield, without her guardianship, the ship of state will sail through uncharted seas, narrowly avoiding rocks and shoals, headed inevitably to the harbor of calamity.

"Justice! Justice! Justice! To thee we pay homage. To thee we dedicate our laurels of hope. Before thee we kneel in adoration, mindful of thy great power, mute before thy inscrutable destiny!"

"Sounds good to me," remarked the amateur spellbinder. "Who's this bird Nevin?"

"Oh, just a cultured gentleman who has studied the main issues and amuses himself reducing them to simple terms such as you have just heard," said Job soothingly. "Nothing would give him more happiness than to have you make this speech in public."

"Would you mention him?"

"Not especially. You might say that you are a student of Nevin and agree with him in most of the principles enunciated. He is really the great American authority on Justice and will make any sacrifice to popularize his doctrines among the plain people."

"All right, Job," replied the visitor. "I'll slam this at them next Saturday night. I'll call the speech 'Rocks and Shoals.' "

* * *

Job later reported over the telephone:

"I heard that speech our East Side friend delivered last night."

"How did it go?"

"A riot. He had twenty vice-presidents on the platform and two pitchers of ice water."

"Did you step up afterward and congratulate him?"

"I did. But that was a tactical blunder."

"What happened?"

"One of the vice-presidents took me aside and asked me what I thought about it. 'Great,' I said. 'Looks to me,' said he, 'like George is standing on the brink of a reputation. He ain't got your easy manner, Job, and he's shy on the wise cracks, but you must admit that he certainly has got command of the English language.' "

Nevin, the author of the speech, died in New York on February 2, 1926.

* * *

Job Hedges sense of humor never deserted him. When the shadow was upon him in Atlantic City the morning of February 10, 1924, he turned to his wife and said: "I must sit up. Help me. When he was adjusted among the pillows he sighed softly, winked at Mrs. Hedges and crossed the one-way river smiling.

And that's the way New Yorkers like to remember him.

Copyright, 1927, by Robert H. Davis, used by permission.

CHARACTER—THE FOUNDATION OF SUCCESSFUL BUSINESS

JOHN D. ROCKEFELLER, JR.

John Davison Rockefeller, Jr., noted philanthropist, was born in Cleveland, Ohio, January 29, 1874. In addition to his active association with his father in business enterprises, Mr. Rockefeller is chairman of the board of the Rockefeller Foundation and the Laura Spelman Rockefeller Memorial, a trustee of the Rockefeller Institute for Medical Research, and a director of many other associations. It has fallen to the lot of Mr. John D. Rockefeller, Jr., to inherit the dual responsibility of vast riches and a gigantic name. He has acquitted himself of this dual responsibility in a way that has earned for him enduring national respect. The address given here was delivered by Mr. Rockefeller during Collier's Radio Hour, Sunday evening, February 12, 1928, over Station WJZ of the National Broadcasting Comany.

It is a distinct privilege for me to be able to address the great unseen audience of American citizens on this, the birthday of Abraham Lincoln. It is a day on which all of us unite in honoring the memory of a great statesman who was also a man of unique directness and simplicity.

The attribute of Lincoln's which, more than any other, has brought him close to the heart of every true American and which makes him a source of inspiration, was his quiet but unswerving strength of character. It is for that reason that Lincoln's birthday seems a particularly appropriate occasion on which to discuss the subject—

"Character—the foundation of successful business."

Fifty years ago, the great problem with which business was grappling was how to organize on a scale commensurate with the growing demands for service made by the ever-increasing population. Now the gigantic corporate form of business, suspected and harassed during the years of its evolution, is accepted as not only useful but indispensable. Business also has turned its attention to the development of better relations between employer and employee and, while much remains to be done, marvelous progress has been made along that line.

Today the vital matter to which business must needs address itself is the re-emphasizing of character and of high standards of business ethics, for upon such a foundation only can business be permanently successful.

Of course other qualities besides character are also necessary—ability, persistence, industry, thrift—but character is indispensable. Some people confuse reputation with character. Reputation is what people think we are; character is what we really are. A good reputation for an individual or business concern is to be desired; far more so a character that is beyond question.

May I mention briefly four qualities which go to make up character? The first is integrity. We put our money in a bank with a sense of security because we believe in the integrity of those in charge. A man may speculate in the hope of making a lucky turn, but he invests his money in enterprises conducted by men of known integrity. Integrity in business means a trade as good for one party as for the other. A man may get the better of you in a bargain once, but you continue to do business with those people only whom you know are looking out for your interests as well as their own.

In the second place, character implies obedience to law—irrespective of whether one likes the law, believes in it or is opposed to it. How well known to all of us are instances of law breaking like the following: Here is a woman who says, "I don't believe in the customs law. It is foolish and unwarranted. Therefore I feel perfectly justified in smuggling." With equal propriety says the footpad, "This law against highway robbery cramps my style and forces me to the unwelcome alternative of earning an honest living." And he holds up the next automobile that passes.

Another illustration of this same attitude is the feeling on the part of many people that the 18th amendment is an infringement of personal liberty and therefore its observance is purely optional. To my way of thinking it is absolutely on all fours with the cases cited above.

And again the same disregard for law sometimes shows itself in connection with the operations of business. There are a large and increasing number of laws regulating business. The great majority of them are undoubtedly wise and in the interest of the people. Some unnecessarily hamper and restrict business and do not serve the common good. Here, as in any of these other instances of regrettably common lawlessness, one has respect for the man who seeks by every legitimate means to bring about the repeal of a law which he honestly thinks to be contrary to the public interest. But law is law, whether it affects personal liberty, social well-being or business; so long as it remains the law of the land it should be obeyed by individuals and by corporations. The alternative is anarchy.

A third requisite of character is clean living. With the changing point of view of modern times in regard to moral questions, one almost wonders whether there is any such thing as fixed moral standards. And yet, with all due allowance for legitimate differences of opinion, way down within us all we know that those things which keep us physically fit, mentally vigorous and spiritually sensitive make for clean living and fine character, while whatever tends to defile the "house beautiful" in which our spirit dwells, to dull the power of our minds, to lower our ideals, is unworthy.

In these days of unprecedented and widespread prosperity in our land, with self-indulgence growing, individual liberty too frequently becoming license, and will power weakened by the less virile conditions of life, there is serious need of re-emphasizing the underlying importance of clean living as a requisite of business success. The good mixer, the hail-fellow-well-met is an asset in any business, but when he feels it necessary to "go the pace," whether from personal inclination or ostensibly to maintain his business contacts, he becomes a distinct liability to his company, and a positive menace to its public standing and its morale, both of which are of basic importance. A new emphasis of high ideals of personal living is greatly needed in business today, also, may I add, men with the courage to live up to their convictions.

The fourth and final quality which I would mention is singleness of purpose or loyalty. Nothing truer was ever said than that "no man can serve two masters." So obvious is this fact that it has been embodied in law, which forbids the receiving of a commission from both buyer and seller. Often, however, in so insidious a way is influence brought to bear to break down one's singleness of purpose that the approach is not easy to recognize.

One's value to an employer is in large measure dependent upon singleness of purpose. If in considering advice given or an opinion expressed one must always wonder whether it is disinterested or whether personal advantage enters in, its value is seriously discounted. To be worthy of the complete confidence of our associates, to know that they can put a hundred per cent reliance in the disinterestedness of the opinions which we express, is one of the finest things in life. No gain to be derived from undertaking to ride two horses at the same time can begin to equal the satisfaction thus realized.

These then are certain of the fundamental qualities that underlie character—integrity, obedience to law, clean living and singleness of purpose. Is there any one of them that can be omitted or ignored without hazarding continuing business success? It is true that money is often made by trickery and sharp practice, but successful business is not established on a foundation so shifting.

Regretfully must we admit that instances are not lacking of corporations and individuals who set themselves up as superior to law, but when condemned, as they are sure to be, in the court of public opinion, even the most worldly minded is bound to ask himself, "Does it pay?" and to admit that no business can be permanently successful which is not law-abiding.

As for clean living, is it not obvious that that man stands the best chance of winning out in any sphere who is sound in body, alert of mind and fearless of heart? Singleness of purpose, the loyalty of those with whom we are associated, gives us confidence in our fellows and makes great enterprises and achievement possible.

But, someone says, the pressure of competition is so tremendous that is it not always practicable to maintain these standards, much as we may believe in them. I answer that no honest stockholder in any company wants profits derived from compromise with right, nor would he wittingly permit, much less expect, any act to be performed by anyone representing the company, from the president to the office boy, which he would not himself be willing to perform. This is a position which cannot be too strongly stated. It is a platform on which I have always stood like the rock of Gibraltar.

Every ambitious, self-respecting individual wants to make a living. That he should do, and as much more as his services to society justify. But in this money-mad age we do well to remind ourselves that after all the real purpose of our existence is not to make a living, but to make a life—a worthy, well-rounded and useful life. In the long run, therefore, anything that defeats that purpose is not worth the cost.

Each one of us to a certain degree holds in his hand the reputation of his business associates. The man who renders efficient, cheerful service brings direct credit upon everyone connected with the company that employs him. Where an employee, of whatever rank, fails to live up to the highest standards in his individual business life, he is bringing discredit upon his associates and his employers.

Truly it has been said that no man can live unto himself alone, our lives are too interdependent. It is because I believe so profoundly in these principles of business ethics and because I am so proud of what many companies are doing along these lines that I covet for business generally the best in personal character, in ideals, as well as in financial success.

By permission of the author.

HOW TO END WAR

WILLIAM E. BORAH

William Edgar Borah, lawyer, and United States Senator from Idaho (Republican), was born at Fairfield, Illinois, 1865; studied at the University of Kansas, and practised law in Kansas until he removed to Boise, Idaho, in 1891. He has been an outstanding figure in the Senate since 1907 and, since the World War, has been conspicuous in his opposition to the United States entering the League of Nations.

This speech Senator Borah delivered at the Academy of Music, Philadelphia, December 17, 1924.

I HAVE been asked to discuss before you this evening the "Outlawry of War." If instead of using the term "outlawry of war" I should say "the substitution of law and judicial tribunals for politics and force in international affairs," it would mean the same thing, and perhaps appeal to you as more practical and less ideal.

The scheme to outlaw war involves three leading propositions: *First,* the creation of a body of international law—the amplification and codification of international law. It involves going as far as it is humanly possible at this time in reducing international relations to established rules of conduct—to bring international affairs under the reign of law. *Secondly,* the establishment of an independent judicial tribunal with jurisdiction and power to decide and determine all controversies involving a construction of international law or treaties. The advocates of the plan do not insist upon the rejection of the present tribunal; they do urge, however, that it be divorced from all connection with international political institutions, that it shall function under a body of laws and be governed in its power and jurisdiction by law—that its jurisdiction shall attach by reason of the nature of the controversy and by authority of law, and not by reason of the consent of the foreign offices of the different governments. *Thirdly*, the said body of international law shall declare war a crime and no longer recognize in any way or at any time war as a legitimate institution for the settlement of international disputes. In other words, if war comes it must be without the shield or sanction of law, but in violation of it, as piracy or slavery or peonage or murder. These are the general principles, the details and the feasibility of which I shall discuss in a few moments.

Lord Cecil, lately honored for his services in the cause of peace, has been quoted as saying "We have not reached the state in international relations at which it is desirable to attempt the codification of international law," which is in effect to say we cannot now consent to be governed by international law. Why it is not desirable we are not informed. Not desirable to be governed by law and the courts rather than secret diplomacy, intrigue, overreaching imperialism, politics, and force? It would seem at least to be desirable. We have waited three thousand years. If the time has not come for Europe to acknowledge the reign of law and to be governed by it in international affairs, then it is positively certain that the time has not come for the people of this country to be governed by European politics. We will hesitate to enter a game the rules of which are not known but exist, if they exist at all, in the caprice and the ambitions of a few men.

Americans believe in a government of law, and not of men, and that is infinitely more important in international affairs where peace and war are involved than in domestic affairs. We believe that in international affairs as in domestic affairs order and peace can exist only and alone under law construed and applied through an independent and impartial judicial tribunal. It may be that political bodies, responsible in no sense to and uncontrolled by the people, with jurisdiction as broad as human discretion and as irresponsible as human intrigue, may be safe for other people—but not for those who have built their institutions and founded their civilization upon a government of law.

This does not mean that we are not deeply interested in Europe, both from a humanitarian and material standpoint. It does not mean we shall not co-operate when co-operation is possible. But many of us believe that co-operation in the cause of peace and the coming together between Europe and the Western continent in their respective efforts to work out plans of peace must be through a body of international law construed by an uncontrolled judicial body, a judicial body free alike from American and European politics. It does not seem to me possible to conform the politics of these different continents to a common political scheme for peace. But it would seem that there are certain fundamental principles of right and justice and peace which could be embodied in international law supported by the public opinion of the world, and this body of international law would gather up and avail itself of the respective efforts for peace. There is only one possible connection which can be established, and that connection is law. I venture to believe that the American people will never consent to become a part of any scheme or plan for peace which at any time or under any circumstances recognizes war as a legitimate and rightful method of settling disputes or which plan or scheme is controlled through or by international politics. If war is ever to be resorted to, the American people will reserve the absolute freedom, unhampered and uncontracted, to determine when and where and under what circumstances such action shall be taken.

In discussing peace plans, I do not wish to be understood as necessarily criticizing or condemning plans which deal with European conditions alone. If the League of Nations or the Protocol, or any other plan, considered as European enterprises, can be made to serve the cause of justice and peace in Europe, in common with all lovers of peace I would rejoice. If the League fits her conditions and helps in the solution of her awful problems, no one could be other than profoundly pleased. It was said long ago that "Europe has a set of primary interests which to us have none or a very remote relation." I have no doubt that that is still true, even more emphatically true than at the time it was uttered. We can have no more justification, therefore, for denouncing European peace institutions or seeking to embarrass their development than we could have in denouncing the forms of government of her respective countries. We have been too often disposed of late to set ourselves up as a judge of other people's institutions. To speak plainly, it is not only presumptuous but it is always fruitful of unhappy results. It is not for us to say what form of government other people shall have nor what plans and schemes for peace Europe may have. It is only when we are asked to join or become a part of them that we are not only justified but commanded by every sense of patriotic duty to examine with candor and courage these proposals.

The Protocol put forth at Geneva indicates unmistakably that Europe now proposes to adjust her affairs and to pursue her peace plans according to European conditions and in harmony with European standards—a conclusion which may be in the interest of good understanding and peace. An attempt to have Europe conform to our standards based upon our conditions or to have America accept European standards based upon European conditions can only result in disappointment and failure. Professor Murray, the distinguished English advocate of the League and the Protocol, speaking of the Protocol, candidly and wisely declared: "No one asks or expects America to sign the Protocol. . . . If she will keep the peace in her own regions of the globe, and not prevent the European nations from keeping the peace in theirs, she will be doing a great deal." Professor Shotwell, a most able advocate of peace and also a supporter of the League, has declared that he has not the slightest intention of advocating the adoption of the Protocol by America.

Undoubtedly not only these statements but the Protocol itself discloses that Europe now recognizes that the peace plans which may serve her cause would be inadmissible in America. Tradition, customs, institutions, habits, race—and all the countless kindred things which that word instantly conjures up—cannot be dispelled over night through the necromancy of words. They have to be reckoned with. You cannot get rid of the Atlantic Ocean by covenants and you cannot standardize life in Bulgaria and Pennsylvania by protocols. There is nothing so fatal to the success of any cause or any effort as to refuse to recognize facts as facts and shape your course accordingly. Professor Shotwell, Professor Murray, and eminent statesmen like Beněs, who framed the Protocol, recognize facts; the Protocol is the announcement therefore of a new policy. Europe proposes to work out the problem of peace under the unbending facts which distinguish the Eastern from the Western continent. We shall certainly not denounce their plans because they are not fitted to American conditions or American principles.

Let us digress a little farther before going into the discussion of the details. There is no hope for peace so long as the great and powerful nations will that there shall be no peace. If every time an incident, great or small, arises the powerful nations resort to violence and force, there can be no peace. Nicaragua, Vera Cruz, Haiti, Santo Domingo, Amritsar, the Ruhr, Corfu, Egypt—all save two of these incidents have occurred since the fearful lesson of the World War and all were resorts to violence and force upon the part of the great and powerful nations against the unarmed and helpless. In all of these instances the aggressor nation was strong enough and powerful enough to have invoked conciliation, adjustment, and arbitration, and thus to have set examples and established precedents of more value to the cause of peace than any peace plan. We confine our love of peace to paper; our war spirit finds its expression in deeds. We profess tolerance, and practice intolerance. We profess friendship, and practice vengeance. Under such policies and practices leagues and courts not only prove ineffective but hope sickens, and the morale of the whole human family is broken and demoralized. I would rather have just now one ounce of practice than tons of profession in this cause of peace. Why talk of peace when there are excluded from all plans and all courts two hundred million white people and two of the most potentially powerful peoples of Europe? Let us establish the natural and orderly relationship which should obtain among a family of nations, restore trade relations, recognize existing governments, practice the tolerance we preach and use the friendship we profess, and this will constitute the first great movement for peace.

By permission of *The Nation.*

ROBERT E. LEE

MARTIN W. LITTLETON

Martin W. Littleton is an authoritative lawyer of New York, who has been conspicuous in his profession there since 1896. He was born in Tennessee in 1872.

This address at the Hall of Fame, New York University, was delivered in May, 1923.

Robert E. Lee was the embodiment of a cause which was lost but the representative of a principle which will never die. The cause was the right of a State to withdraw from the Union; the principle was primary and patriotic loyalty to the sovereignty which he acknowledged. It meant, perhaps, more happiness to mankind that the cause should be lost, but it meant perpetuity to civilization that the principle should survive.

This nation was not created and afterwards divided into States, but it grew insensibly from separate, independent colonies into States and cautiously and grudgingly from States into a Union of States. This Union, which has developed into a nation, was foreign to the States, alien to their sentiment and for half a century it claimed little of the affection and primary patriotism of the people. It was the creature of the States and of the people but it did not and could not take the place of the States in the hearts of the people. It was a government apart from the people, the object of their distrust and the victim of their suspicion. It was feared by that feeling which remembered the shadows of authority; it was challenged by that criticism which had challenged the power of the old world. Liberty was the precious realm which a just government was instituted to protect, and that liberty arose from the fireside to the community and from the community to the State, but it did not venture beyond the borders of the State, and it regarded the territory beyond those borders as a wilderness of adventure and danger. Within the comforting and accustomed confines of the States were found all of those cherished attributes of life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness so essential to the individual genius of a liberty loving people.

The rights of persons, the rights of property, the rights of worship, the rights of suffrage: had not all of these and more flourished in the bosoms of the States? What then should become of those if and when the nation should grow in power beyond the States? Every extension of the power of the nation, every advance of the authority of the Union, every new thing awakened from the silence of the new Constitution trespassed upon a region of freedom in the States made sacred by tradition and loyalty.

The Union was indeed alien to the States; it was mistrusted by the States. Almost every section of this Union, at one time or another, without regard to sectional lines, asserted the rights which were finally so bravely and tragically maintained by the South,—not because these sections were disloyal to their country but because they were loyal to the commonwealths which were grounded in the very depths of their patriotic affection.

Washington did not lead his shattered though victorious armies to preserve a nation but to preserve the liberty of thirteen States. Jefferson did not translate the aspirations of a free people into a flaming Declaration in behalf of Union but in behalf of thirteen commonwealths. All of history and tradition gathered about the commonwealth and it has required more than a century of patient growth, reinforced by war at home and abroad, to transfer that affection and loyalty from the State to the Union of States.

This primary patriotism had its roots in the soil of the State; had its sustenance in the spirit of the State; had its flower and fruit in the well being of the State; and if this nation has grown up at last to take that place in the affection and loyalty of the people which hitherto was occupied by the State, it may indeed rest secure in the patriotism of its people.

How noble and inspiring is the character from which we may learn that original lesson of patriotism today! We unveil his passionless features here in this classic Hall of Fame, but the lofty character of his noble countenance has long since been unveiled to the eye of all the world as a prince in peace and a master in war. We bring him into a natural companionship with Lincoln, for each gave to the object of his patriotism as each viewed it the measure of his stainless life, the fullness of his unembittered passion.

By permission of the author.

ABRAHAM LINCOLN

J. J. JUSSERAND

Jean Adrien Antoine Jules Jusserand, for twenty-three years (1902–'24) ambassador from France to the United States, was born in Lyons, France, 1855. He had been in the diplomatic service since he came of age, and from 1898 to 1902 was France's minister to Denmark. He wears the Grand Cross of the Legion of Honor, and a dozen universities have conferred upon him their LL.D., recognizing, besides his long service between the nations, his scholarly abilities as a writer and his distinguished and charming presence. His works include a Literary History of the English People.

This address was delivered at the unveiling of the bust of Abraham Lincoln in the Hall of Fame, New York University, in May, 1923.

A TRUE-BORN American, representing the seventh generation from an original settler arrived in 1637 (his family having since moved about the country, building homes in six different states), the great man of world-wide fame whose bust we are dedicating today came of humble stock and grew up among the humblest surroundings. No family tuition was to help him; scarcely any schooling and scarcely any book was within the reach of one to whom the Fates would give for his task to perfect the work of Washington and make it indestructible.

Reaching boyhood and manhood in Kentucky, Indiana and Illinois, Abraham Lincoln, deprived of the usual assistances,—"I, a friendless, uneducated, penniless boy, working on a flatboat at ten dollars per month"—was fitted for a career unique in the history of the world by the forest, the swamp and the river, by necessity, by the great heart God had given him, in which courage, tenderness, humor, an aptitude for merriment and an aptitude for melancholy, lived together, all kept within bounds by common sense.

These moulded a man who, fearless by nature and habit, surrounded from childhood by the unknown and the unexpected, would be in after life astonished at nothing, and who, in his soul's solitude, with no one to rely upon, would in the everyday difficulties of his rough beginnings gather information by personal experience, silently to think the matter over for himself and take his own decision. Such he was at Pigeon Creek; such was he at the council table during the terrible war.

Concerning the Union his sentiment never changed; his opinion was like that of Washington, who had written: "When the bond of union gets once broken everything ruinous to our future prospects is to be apprehended." Concerning slavery, a friend of liberty though he was, it took him a long time to become an abolitionist; he would have preferred gradual abolition with compensation to the slave owners; in which again his ideas were very similar to those of Washington. When, however, he found that there was no means of preserving the Union save to solve at all risks the old, outstanding problem once for all, his decision became immovable; that heart of his, full of tenderness, became adamant. "This world," he wrote, "is a world of compensation, and he who would be no slave must consent to have no slave." If he should fail he trusted the American people to resume the struggle; if he should die, to continue the unfinished task. "If my own strength should fail," he said, "I shall at least fall back upon these masses who, I think, under any circumstances will not fail."

His transparent honesty, forceful character and earnestness, natural eloquence, mastery of the English language,—so great that, when at his best, one cannot add, suppress, change or displace a word without spoiling his sentence,—and his shrewd intelligence in matters political, had raised him from the obscurity where he lay concealed, to be first, postmaster at now-vanished New Salem; then member of the House of Representatives of Illinois; afterwards member of Congress; and then, on the eve of the most perilous conflict this republic and modern democracy had ever had to face, sixteenth President of the United States.

What the conflict was, between opponents equally brave, equally sure of their rights, all the world knows. Its vicissitudes were followed for four years with heartbeats abroad as well as at home by all the believers in republican institutions. The future of democracy depended in a large measure upon the issue. Could a Republic stand such a test, survive, form again a Union? It did, owing chiefly to that great heart God had given Lincoln, to the chivalrous character of Ulysses S. Grant and Robert E. Lee, both, side by side, justly honored in these halls, and owing also to the equal patriotism of the winners and the losers in the conflict.

Fair to all, just to all, mourning so many losses, in battles where every fighter was an American, preserving a sentiment for "the good men of the South, and I regard the majority of them as such," the great citizen who had entered the war having hoped to the last that it could be avoided,—saying, "We are not enemies, but friends. We must not be enemies,"—saw the end of the storm, and could once more repeat, "We are not enemies but friends," and, his task fulfilled, he fell, the last victim of the cause to which he had dedicated his life.

All nations were stirred with horror; a hero, a martyr, had disappeared from a world the better for his words, his deeds, his example. Regrets and praise were universal; the best praise is perhaps the very simple words engraved on the gold medal which was struck by the French nation for Mrs. Lincoln (and to which, in order to show that it was truly national, no one had been allowed to subscribe more than two cents):

> "Lincoln, honest man, who abolished slavery, re-established the Union, and saved the republic, witout veiling the Statue of Liberty."

Strengthened and united, understanding better for his example, as the Great War showed in our days, the value of disinterested courage and generosity, his nation was now ready for a more brilliant destiny than it had ever known before.

From all parts of the United States, from many parts of the world, pilgrims will come in future times to this shrine. Standing before the bust of Lincoln, they will commune with him, recall his greatness and his services, and leave these precincts with Lowell's beautiful line on their lips:

> "And one of Plutarch's men talked with us face to face."

By permission of the author.

ABRAHAM LINCOLN: MAN AND AMERICAN

STEPHEN S. WISE

Stephen S. Wise, founder and Rabbi of the Free Synagogue, New York, was born in Budapest, Hungary, 1872. He studied at the College of the City of New York and at Columbia University, receiving Columbia's Ph.D. in 1901. Rabbi Wise has been prominent in Jewish religious and philanthropic activities. During a seven-years' residence in Portland, Oregon, he was the founder and first vice-president of the Oregon State Conference of Charities and Correction, and is now a trustee of the National Child Labor Commission, a member of the executive committee of the Woodrow Wilson Foundation, a trustee of the Near East Relief.

This address was delivered at the one hundred and fifth anniversary of the birth of Abraham Lincoln, under the auspices of the Lincoln Centennial Association, at Springfield, Illinois.

THE honoring invitation to give the address of tonight came to me as I was feasting upon the glad beauty of far-distant Venice. On the same day I had gone to one of the beautiful old churches facing St. Mark's and the Doge's palace across the Grand Canal. And there I looked at the grave of the great Doge or Duke Michael, for whom one of the two matchless columns of the Piazza of St. Mark had been erected. On the tomb are written the words: "Here lies the terror of the Greeks. Whosoever thou art who comes to behold this tomb of his, bow thyself down before God because of him." As I stood this day at the tomb of Lincoln, those words recurred to my memory. But Lincoln was not the terror of the Greeks nor terror to any man. Yet we do well to bow ourselves down to God because of him, God's choicest gift to the American nation, America's first commoner.

This is the centenary of another great American, preacher and prophet, Henry Ward Beecher, and therefore I may fittingly refer to the words which he spoke at the death of Lincoln. Beecher said "Not Springfield's but Illinois', not Illinois' but the Nation's, not the nation's but the world's, is this man." Though the name of Lincoln has become a world-wide treasure, how good it is for you to feel that he belongs not to the world but to America, not to America but to Illinois, not to Illinois but to Springfield, to you nearest and dearest of all; and, because he is nearest to you, his memory spells duty and high obligation and inescapable responsibility.

In explanation rather than in criticism of a great writer of another day, it was truly said—Alas for the man who has no shrines! Doubly, trebly true is this of a nation, if it may truly be said that it has no shrines. America has many shrines. We have come to love and to honor many of the great and the good that have made the few years of our history splendid and commanding in the annals of human achievement. But surely there will be no dissenting from the thought that the two chiefest and holiest shrines of America are to be found on the bank of the Potomac and within this city of Illinois, twin shrines for the American people, each of them reverently regarded and tenderly treasured.

What characterization of Lincoln could be more perfect than the word of Ecclesiasticus in which the latter describes the character and the life of another and earlier liberator: "And God brought out a man of mercy, a man loved of God and man, whose memorial is blessed. He sanctified him in his faithfulness and meekness."

A man of mercy! Lincoln was that. Not only was he a man of mercy, but a man of infinite compassion. He was a strong man, a rugged man, a virile man, but such was his strength that it blossomed in unfailing mercy and compassion.

A man beloved of God and men! This was Abraham Lincoln. A man beloved of God, whom God raised from among the simplest and the lowliest of the people to be a prince among men, and to be remembered reverently and tenderly long after the princes of the earth shall have been forgotten. A man loved of God and men! Men did not always love him; they did not always understand him. It was just before his passing, as the bearer of a martyr's crown, that men began to understand this man. But how men have loved him since! How the world has come to cherish him as its own! But it is all so obvious and inevitable. Lincoln was God's man, and God's man who can withstand?

His memorial is blest. What better proof than that we are gathered in this hour, as men are wont to gather at a shrine, in order to do homage to one of the two august memories of American history, the earlier memory, austere and majestic, the later memory more human and kindly and benign.

Saint Beuve has said, "The glory of Bossuet has become one of the religions of France. We recognize, we proclaim it, we honor ourselves by paying to it daily a new tribute." May we not say that the glory of Lincoln has become one of the religions of America—a religion of the American people? The glory of Lincoln, who was more than President, more than statesman, more than martyr, is one of our religions. If we do not worship him, it is not, as Carlyle says, that "men worship the shows of great men; the most disbelieve that there is any reality of great men to worship," but because he is almost too great for our homage and too lofty for our praise. His glory is our religion. His memory is a consecration of American life.

It is well to emphasize every day, and more than ever at such a time as this, that Lincoln is a religion in our land, lest some of us imagine that the railroad-dividend, or the yield of the mine or the harvest of the field, or the output of the factory, or the cash-book of the warehouse, is our religion. In the temple of deathless fame his memory is enshrined. We do not know whether his bust has been chosen to adorn a niche in the Hall of Fame on the University Heights in New York; if not, it is because he is Fame. His tomb at Springfield is not less sacred and precious than the grave at Mt. Vernon, each a revered shrine of the American people, each a hallowed altar of humanity.

Vindication of the American democracy—we call this man of the people, simply sublime because sublimely simple. Let other nations boast of their achievements; we point to Lincoln, the man—not unique, but uniquely American, matchless the world over, but completely, robustly, sincerely American.

No miracle was he who was the inevitable product of the American people. Far greater than the seeming miracle of his life would have been the failure of America to bring forth a man equal to its supreme trial. Not by virtue of accident rose Lincoln to the place of liberator of a race and saviour of a nation. The mission came to the man because he was the man for the mission. The unutterable privilege of breaking the shackles from off millions of slaves had to come to Abraham Lincoln, because of the destiny of his character—this man of rugged strength of character, uncompromising conscience, unspoiled simplicity of heart, blameless purity of soul, whose was the greatness of real goodness and the goodness of real greatness.

Turning for a moment to a foreign estimate of Lincoln, which naturally is temperate and sober and in no sense perfervid, we find the French Democracy some years back casting a commemorative medal inscribed: "Lincoln—honest man, abolished slavery, re-established the Union, saved the Republic." The "honest man" of the French characterization explains everything else. There is a direct and inevitable relation between "honest man" and all the rest. Great as were his achievements, the French people rightly felt that the man was even greater than his works. "Honest man" France names him; the Negro race called him "Father Abraham"—a title infinitely more to be desired than "Conqueror," which is the portion of an Alexander or a Napoleon.

We are often reminded, and not without justice, that there is nothing supremely great in American art, or letters, that the contributions of America to the world's treasure-stores are all material, such as the cotton-gin and the steam press, the telegraph and steamboat, the telephone and harvester. If American letters have produced nothing superlatively great, we have something superlatively great to offer to history in the life of the founder of the Republic and in the life of him who was the saviour of the Nation and the restorer of our National Union. We point to Lincoln, the man. Beecher apostrophizes him as Illinois' gift to the Nation. Lowell glorifies him as the new birth of our new soil—the first American. Emerson sees that he is an heroic figure at the centre of an heroic epoch. Wendell Phillips proudly hails him as the natural growth of democratic institutions. And Phillips Brooks honors him with a name above every other that he might have asked—this best and most American of all Americans.

Lincoln was the most American of Americans. It cannot truly be said that Lincoln was not a type. God help us if Lincoln be not a type, if it be true that he stands alone, without fellows, without ancestors and without successors. His ancestors were Cromwell and Hampden, Hancock and Adams, Washington and Franklin. His ancestry was the Magna Charta and the Declaration of Independence. Among his forerunners were Garrison, John Brown, Theodore Parker; Lincoln himself was just and generous to say of his forerunners, the intrepid Abolitionists, that their moral power had enabled him to do all.

Lincoln was chosen out of the people—the great American commoner, plain man of the people, as Emerson first styled him. To be the first man of a people in a land where every citizen is king is to be the manliest of men and the kingliest of kings—king by divine right, by the divinest of rights—the right of manhood and worth and character. Is it not the very Paladium of our liberty that the commoner, the homespun man, may rise to the highest station in the land? Is it not the inspiration of our youth and the pride of our manhood that the commoner, speaking for his kind, voiced the abiding truth: Government of the people, by the people and for the people shall not perish from the earth?

As one thinks of the two shrines of American history, and to these others will be added in the years that are to come, how are they confounded who declare that the people whom Lincoln trusted cannot even now be completely trusted! How often have we erred in the one hundred and thirty years of American history in the matter of choosing the Chief Magistrate of the nation? Not once have we chosen badly. What kingdom or empire of the earth has done as well? Within seventy-five years this nation chose two men as President of the United States who are to stand among the world's immortals—Washington and Lincoln within one century! Match that in all the centuries of the earth's kingdoms and empires. What European nation has had two rulers from 1789 to this hour who compare in moral and spiritual stature with these two giants of a giant continent?

Lincoln the man is at one and the same time the vindication of the American democracy and of the dignity and nobleness of the common people from whom he was sprung. He proved anew that the uncommonest men and women rise out of the ranks of the so-called common people.

How the memory of Lincoln rebukes the pettily arrogant and the meanly proud, who disdain and even abhor the common people because they are not nice nor yet refined nor yet cultivated! Lincoln was not nice; he was simple, rough, uncouth, elemental, himself. He never talked very much about democracy or the common people because he was one of them. In the mind and speech of Lincoln, the people were never "They" but always "We." Lincoln was saved from the ungenuineness of a lip-philanthropy by his common sense, his most uncommon sense of humor, his utterly democratic spirit.

Sprung from the people and trusting in the people, the people trusted and loved him. "They who trust us educate us." They alone distrust the people who are not worthy of a people's trust. Let not a man of the people who trusts and would serve them, who dares to speak of the duties of the strong and the rights of the weak, be derided as a demagogue. For Lincoln was a man of the people—not a blatant demagogue, not a democrat on parade, but so democratic, so firmly trusting in the people that the immortal watchword that he gave to the nation was the necessary expression of the fundamental democracy of faith and life of him "whose genuine love of the people no one could suspect of being either the cheap flattery of the demagogue or the abstract philanthropy of the philosopher." As one reviews the life of Lincoln, the prophet of democracy, one is moved to say that no man has the right to call himself a democrat who distrusts the people, who is fearful of entrusting the people with plenary power, who is afraid that the popular rights movement has "gone too far." Lincoln trusted the common people with less reason for faith than have we. We have every reason to trust the people, which moved him to place his trust in them, and one besides, Lincoln himself—the common people incarnate in this type of man.

Democracy means not the eternal sounding of futile shibboleths, such as State rights—too often an apology for a state of wrong—but the application of fundamental political principles to the working out of the problems of American life and American welfare. Democracy is to be something more than the pose of a hungry office-hunting minority or majority; it is to be the genuine conviction of a vast majority, not the slogan of a party, but the ideal of the whole nation.

Lincoln came of a race of pioneers, of men who dared to the very verge of their being. We, too, in our day must pioneer as did Lincoln in his—not rashly adventurous but bravely daring in the enterprises of the soul. Rash and fool-hardy were deemed the pioneers of a century ago. In truth, they adventured much, but only they were rash and fool-hardy who little esteemed the pioneers and appraised them low. Pioneers must we be in the new world of our making and of our re-creating, with the qualities of the pioneers who, above all, were the soldiers of the common weal. Not pioneering for themselves, for he is no pioneer who would serve himself alone, but pioneers merely that we may occupy the outposts of new realms of the spirit and new regions of achievement to be peopled and to be blessed by the generations for which we shall have prepared the way as Lincoln prepared the way for us gathered to do him homage!

In a very real sense, Lincoln was prophetic of that which is yet to be, prophetic of the new religion, though he knew it not, prophetic of the religion of Abraham and Moses and Jesus and Lincoln—the religion which is summarized in the words—Love of God and love of neighbor.

Lincoln was prophetic in yet another sense, for he was the foreseer of the newer and truer democracy. He struck a deadly blow at that most terrible of all castes, the caste of race. If we are to be true to his memory, we must strike other and telling blows at every vestige of the false idolatry of caste and rank. Democracy is not an institution to be created nor a structure to be established nor even an ideal to be realized. More unsubstantial, withal more vital and preduring than all of these, be it not forgotten that democracy is the attitude of the common mind, that it is the aspiration of the commonalty.

Lincoln fulfilled the idea laid down in the holy writ for the governance of those who are to choose judges and rulers of the people: "Moreover, thou shalt choose out of all the people men of strength, such as fear God, men of truth, hating their own gain."

Men of strength were the judges and rulers to be! He was a man of that moral strength which is the noblest courage—strong enough to dare to be in the right and to do the right though he musts needs stand alone. Let us not forget his strength, who was as strong as he was simple, not only strong enough to carry on a mighty war to a triumphant close, but strong enough to oppose an unjust war, even though waged by his country. So strong was he that, refusing to be goaded on by his friends and unafraid of his foes, he issued the Emancipation Proclamation at the right hour, when it was destined to achieve the greatest good. Man of strength was he who, three days before his assassination, gave voice to the guiding rule of his life: "Important principles may and must be inflexible"; who, in his Cooper Union address, delivered himself of the almost prophetic burden: "Let us have faith that right makes might, and in that faith let us to the end dare do our duty as we understand it."

Such as fear God! Fearless before man, Abraham Lincoln feared God. Lip-piety was not of the substance of his religion, nor was he given to many professions of faith, but he walked in the fear of God. Not only was he a profoundly religious man, the content of whose life was rooted in religion, whose religion flowered in the beauty of the good and the true, but his was a conscious faith in a supreme purpose. Almost might one say in paraphrase of the word of Schiller, that the churches were not religious enough to command his allegiance. The question touching his day is not so much whether Lincoln was a churchman, but whether the churches of his time were Lincoln-like. Only to a God-fearing man could have come the inspiration with which he closed his second inaugural address: "With malice toward none, with charity for all, with firmness in the right as God gives us to see the right, let us strive on to finish the work we are in." Such fear of God is a nation's strength.

Men of truth! Scorning to tell a lie and lover of truth, this man who could not stoop to think or to speak a lie, was little likely to act or to live a lie. Compromise and time-serving were strangers to his vocabulary. Wise but not fearful, circumspect but not compromising, careful but unafraid was he. Nothing could be unfairer than to think of Lincoln, as is sometimes done, as if he had been a man of political cunning, lacking in intellectual stability and moral courage. He was open-minded, but he was sturdily self-reliant. He was intellectually receptive, but always self-contained, even as he was a man of the people though never common. Carl Schurz tells that in the first Springfield legislature in which he sat, he recorded his protest against a pro-slavery resolution, though followed by only one other man. So did he love truth and scorn a lie that when he was warned in advance against the consequences of his Springfield address, he silenced his timid friends with the unforgettable words: "It is true, and I will deliver it as written."

Hating their own gain! Self-seeking was far from him and the quest after gain of any kind was unthinkable in this lover of his country. He was not a President with a conscience, but he was conscience incarnate in a President. He hated the gain of the people's praise, even the gain of such popular good-will as would bring about his re-election, unless such gain could be had without the sacrifice of self-respect. He was a statesman who pleaded ever for truth and never for victory. He would have shared Lowell's scorn for the party which builds a platform as a bridge to victory and not, one might add, as a refuge for truth. The people could not flatter him, politicians could not frighten him, riches could not purchase him, ambition could not unsteady him, power could not dazzle him, who served his conscience as his king, who "held his steadfast way like the sun across the firmament."

Rightly was it said of Lincoln that his was a character such as only freedom knows how to make. If our democracy become polluted by the taint of caste, it will produce no Abraham Lincolns. Lincoln fought not so much slavery as the thing which made it possible—the feudal spirit of caste of which negro slavery was only the most abhorrent symptom. It was a noble prophecy of a tribune of the people, George William Curtis, that the part assigned to this country in the good fight of man is the total overthrow of the spirit of caste. It is a far cry from the riotous opposition to the appearance of a coat-of-arms, in the late thirties of the last century, on the carriage of a rich New York family, to the title-hunting mothers and fathers of our own day, who prefer the purchase of some negligible dukelet or paltry princeling to the best of men, if so be he bear no prouder title than that of fellow-American of Abraham Lincoln.

We need today, be it said in the spirit of Abraham Lincoln, not a new South but a true South—a South that shall be true to itself, true to the Union and true to the principles of true democracy, a South that shall not have the name of democracy upon its lips and despotism in its heart. One thing is certain—that the way not to prepare the negro for citizenship is the way in large part of the South which denies to the negro the right to a complete education, which grants him little more than the shreds and scraps of a rudimentary education that is not worthy of the name. Unless Lincoln's work is to have been done in vain, the South must not fix upon servitude without chains as the abiding portion of the Negro race.

Lincoln has conferred a new dignity upon labor, but the new dignity of labor must include larger dignity and fuller life for the toiler. If it be true, as Lincoln said, that to secure to each laborer the whole product of his labor, or as nearly as possible, is a worthy object of any good government, then children shall cease to toil, then Northern capital shall cease to enslave the children of the South, then women must not be overworked and underpaid, must not be driven into shame from shop and store and factory by a starvation wage, then man must have a larger and larger share of the fruits of his labor. If we are to do Lincoln's work, we must enfranchise all men, and first of all ourselves, into that glorious liberty of the sons of God which has been appointed to us, that we, the citizens of the American democracy, may be the emancipators of untold millions for all time.

Not very long ago I was invited to purchase a volume purporting to set forth the genealogy of Lincoln. The price of the volume was to be ten dollars, something more than the value of the house in which Lincoln was born. The descent of Lincoln is of very little importance by the side of the question—how shall we avert a descent from Lincoln? What can we do in order to ascend to the heights on which he stood? This Lincoln commemoration from year to year will be of little value unless, in the spirit of the Gettysburg address, we make it tell by dedicating ourselves anew to the things for which he lived and died. The important thing today is not what we say of Lincoln but what Lincoln would say of us if he were here in this hour and could note the drift and tendency in American' life and American politics. Are we true to him, are we loyal to his memory?

Edmund Burke once said that during the reign of the kings of Spain of the Austrian family, whenever they were at a loss in the Spanish Councils, it was common for their statesmen to say that they ought to consult the genius of Phillip II. We dwell in times of great perplexity and are beset by far-reaching problems of social, industrial and political import. We shall not greatly err if upon every occasion we consult the genius of Abraham Lincoln. We shall not falter nor swerve from the path of national righteousness if we live by the moral genius of the great American commoner.

Instead of following Lincoln, we too often strive to make it appear that he is following us. Instead of emulating him we too often venture to appropriate him. Instead of sitting at his feet as his disciples, and humbly heeding the echoes of his lips, we attribute to him our own petty slogans. The truth is that Lincoln belongs to no party today, though in his time he stood well and firmly within party ranks. His spirit ought today to inform all parties. He was a partisan second, an American first, as he is the first of Americans. Men and measures must not claim him for their own. He remains the standard by which to measure men. His views are not binding upon us, but his point of view will always be our inspiration. He would not be blindly followed who was open-minded and open-visioned. He did not solve all the problems of the future, but he did solve the problem of his own age. Ours it is not to claim his name for our standards but his aim as our standard.

Lincoln is become for us the test of human worth, and we honor men in the measure in which they approach the absolute standard of Abraham Lincoln. Other men may resemble and approach him; he remains the standard whereby all other men are measured and appraised. Gibbon tells us that two hundred and fifty years after the death of Trajan the Senate, in calling out the customary acclamation on the accession of an Emperor, wished that he might surpass the felicity of Augustus and the virtue of Trajan. Melior Trajano—better than Trajan! Such a standard is Lincoln become for us, save that we dare not hope that any American may serve his country better than did Lincoln. However covetous of honor for our country we may be, we cherish no higher hope for the land we love than that the servants of the Republic in all time may rise to the stature of Abraham Lincoln.

In his lifetime Lincoln was maligned and traduced, but detraction during a man's lifetime affords no test of his life's value nor offers any forecast of history's verdict. It would almost seem as if the glory of immortality were anticipated in the life of the great by detraction and denial whilst yet they lived. When a Lincoln-like man arises, let us recognize and fitly honor him. There could be no poorer way of honoring the memory of Lincoln than to assume, as we sometimes do, that the race of Lincolns has perished from the earth, and that we shall never look upon his like again. One way to ensure the passing of the Lincolns is to assume that another Lincoln can nevermore arise. Would we find Lincoln today, we must not seek him in the guise of a rail-splitter, nor as a wielder of the backwoodsman's axe, but as a mighty smiter of wrong in high places and low.

Not very long ago I chanced upon a rarely beautiful custom in the city of Florence. It was the day of the martyrdom "of a prophet sent by God." A multitude stood before the spot where he was done to death—his hands miraculously uplifted in blessing in the very moment of torture and death—and every man brought a rose petal in token of reverence and gratitude to the martyred soul. This day every American citizen, every American man and woman and child has in spirit brought a petal to the grave of Lincoln, who sleeps tonight beneath a wilderness of love-tokens from men of all faiths and tongues and races and backgrounds—who are become one and indivisible in their love and honor for the memory of Abraham Lincoln.

I have sometimes thought that the noblest tribute paid to the memory of Lincoln was the word of Phillips Brooks in Westminster Abbey when, pointing out that the test of the world to every nation was—Show us your man—he declared that America names Lincoln. But the first word spoken after the death of Lincoln is truest and best—the word of Secretary of War Stanton, standing by the side of that scene of peace—"Now he belongs to the ages." It was verdict and prophecy alike, for Lincoln is not America's, he is the world's; he belongs not to our age, but to the ages; and yet, though he belongs to all time and to all peoples, he is our own, for he was an American.

By permission of the author.

BUSINESS—A PROFESSION

LOUIS D. BRANDEIS

Louis D. Brandeis was appointed an associate justice of the Supreme Court of the United States in 1916. He had been counsel in many famous cases and Government investigations and was known as a champion of the rights of the people. Though identified with Boston, Massachusetts, where he had practised law since 1879,—he was graduated LL.B. from the Harvard Law School,—Justice Brandeis was born in Louisville, Kentucky (1856).

EACH commencement season we are told by the college reports the number of graduates who have selected the professions as their occupations and the number of those who will enter business. The time has come for abandoning such a classification. Business should be, and to some extent already is, one of the professions. The once meagre list of the learned professions is being constantly enlarged. Engineering in its many branches already takes rank beside law, medicine and theology. Forestry and scientific agriculture are securing places of honor. The new professions of manufacturing, of merchandising, of transportation and of finance must soon gain recognition. The establishment of business schools in our universities is a manifestation of the modern conception of business.

The peculiar characteristics of a profession as distinguished from other occupations, I take to be these:

First. A profession is an occupation for which the necessary preliminary training is intellectual in character, involving knowledge and to some extent learning, as distinguished from mere skill.

Second. It is an occupation which is pursued largely for others and not merely for one's self.

Third. It is an occupation in which the amount of financial return is not the accepted measure of success.

Is not each of these characteristics found today in business worthily pursued?

The field of knowledge requisite to the more successful conduct of business has been greatly widened by the application to industry not only of chemical, mechanical and electrical science, but also the new science of management; by the increasing difficulties involved in adjusting the relations of labor to capital; by the necessary intertwining of social with industrial problems; by the ever extending scope of state and federal regulation of business. Indeed, mere size and territorial expansion have compelled the business man to enter upon new and broader fields of knowledge in order to match his achievements with his opportunities.

This new development is tending to make business an applied science. Through this development the relative value in business of the trading instinct and of mere shrewdness have, as compared with other faculties, largely diminished. The conception of trade itself has changed. The old idea of a good bargain was a transaction in which one man got the better of another. The new idea of a good contract is a transaction which is good for both parties to it.

Under these new conditions, success in business must mean something very different from mere money-making. In business the able man ordinarily earns a larger income than one less able. So does the able man in the recognized professions—in law, medicine or engineering; and even in those professions more remote from money-making, like the ministry, teaching or social work. The world's demand for efficiency is so great and the supply so small, that the price of efficiency is high in every field of human activity.

The recognized professions, however, definitely reject the size of the financial return as the measure of success. They select as their test, excellence of performance in the broadest sense—and include, among other things, advance in the particular occupation and service to the community. These are the bases of all worthy reputation in the recognized professions. In them a large income is the ordinary incident of success; but he who exaggerates the value of the incident is apt to fail of real success.

To the business of today a similar test must be applied. True, in business the earning of profit is something more than an incident of success. It is an essential condition of success; because the continued absence of profit itself spells failure. But while loss spells failure, large profits do not connote success. Success must be sought in business also in excellence of performance; and in business, excellence of performance manifests itself, among other things, in the advancing of methods and processes; in the improvement of products; in more perfect organization, eliminating friction as well as waste; in bettering the condition of the workingmen, developing their faculties and promoting their happiness; and in the establishment of right relations with customers and with the community.

In the field of modern business, so rich in opportunity for the exercise of man's finest and most varied mental faculties and moral qualities, mere money-making cannot be regarded as the legitimate end. Neither can mere growth in bulk or power be admitted as a worthy ambition. Nor can a man nobly mindful of his serious responsibilities to society, view business as a game; since with the conduct of business human happiness or misery is inextricably interwoven.

Real success in business is to be found in achievements comparable rather with those of the artist or the scientist, of the inventor or the statesman. And the joys sought in the profession of business must be like their joys and not the mere vulgar satisfaction which is experienced in the acquisition of money, in the exercise of power or in the frivolous pleasure of mere winning.

It was such real success, comparable with the scientist's, the inventor's, the statesman's, which marked the career of William H. McElwain of Boston, who died in 1908 at the age of forty-one. He had been in business on his own account but thirteen years. Starting without means, he left a fortune, all of which had been earned in the competitive business of shoe manufacturing, without the aid of either patent or trademark. That shows McElwain did not lack the money-making faculty. His company's sales grew from $75,957 to $8,691,274 in 1908. He became thus one of the largest shoe manufacturers in the world. That shows he did not lack either ambition or organizing ability. The working capital required for this rapidly growing business was obtained by him without surrendering to outside investors or to bankers any share in the profits of business: all the stock in his company being owned either by himself or his active associates. That shows he did not lack financial skill.

But this money-making faculty, organizing ability and financial skill were with him servants, not masters. He worked for nobler ends than mere accumulation or lust of power. In those thirteen years McElwain made so many advances in the methods and practices of the long-established and prosperous branch of industry in which he was engaged, that he may be said to have revolutionized shoe manufacturing. He found it a trade; he left it an applied science.

This is the kind of thing he did: In 1902 the irregularity in the employment of the shoe worker was brought to his attention. He became greatly impressed with its economic waste, with the misery to the workers and the demoralization which attended it. Irregularity of employment is the worst and most extended of industrial evils. Even in fairly prosperous times the workingmen of America are subjected to enforced idleness and loss of earnings, on the average, probably ten to twenty per cent of their working time. The irregularity of employment was no greater in the McElwain factories than in other shoe factories. The condition was not so bad in shoe manufacturing as in many other branches of industry. But it was bad enough; for shoe manufacturing was a seasonal industry. Most manufacturers closed their factories twice a year. Some manufacturers had two additional slack periods.

This irregularity had been accepted by the trade—by manufacturers and workingmen alike—as inevitable. It had been bowed to as if it were a law of nature—a cross to be borne with resignation. But with McElwain an evil recognized was a condition to be remedied; and he set his great mind to solving the problem of irregularity of employment in his own factories; just as Wilbur Wright applied his mind to the aeroplane; as Bell, his mind to the telephone; and as Edison, his mind to the problems of electric light. Within a few years irregularity of employment had ceased in the McElwain factories; and before his death every one of his many thousand employees could find work three hundred and five days in the year.

Closely allied with the establishment of regularity of employment was the advance made by McElwain in introducing punctual delivery of goods manufactured by his company. Shoes are manufactured mainly upon orders; and the orders are taken on samples submitted. The samples are made nearly a year before the goods are sold to the consumer. Samples for the shoes which will be bought in the spring and summer of 1913 were made in the early summer of 1912. The solicitation of orders on these samples began in the late summer. The manufacture of the shoes commences in November; and the order is filled before July.

Dates of delivery are fixed, of course, when orders are taken; but the dates fixed had not been taken very seriously by the manufacturers; and the trade was greatly annoyed by irregularities in delivery. McElwain recognized the business waste and inconvenience attendant upon such unfulfilled promises. He insisted that an agreement to deliver on a certain day was as binding as an agreement to pay a note on a certain day.

He knew that to make punctual delivery possible, careful study and changes in the methods of manufacture and of distribution were necessary. He made the study; he introduced the radical changes found necessary; and he so perfected his organization that customers could rely absolutely upon delivery on the day fixed. Scientific management practically eliminated the recurring obstacles of the unexpected. To attain this result business invention of a high order was of course necessary—invention directed to the departments both of production and of distribution.

The career of the Filenes of Boston affords another example of success in professionalized business. In 1891 the Filenes occupied two tiny retail stores in Boston. The floor space of each was only twenty feet square. One was a glove stand, the other a women's specialty store. Twenty years later their sales were nearly $5,000,000 a year. In September, 1912, they moved into a new building with more than nine acres of floor space. But the significant thing about their success is not their growth in size or in profits. The trade offers many other examples of similar growth. The pre-eminence of the Filenes lies in the advance which has been made in the nature, the aims and the ideals of retailing, due to their courage, initiative, persistence and fine spirit. They have applied minds of a high order and a fine ethical sense to the prosaic and seemingly uninteresting business of selling women's garments. Instead of remaining petty tradesmen, they have become, in every sense of the word, great merchants.

The Filenes recognized that the function of retail distribution should be undertaken as a social service, equal in dignity and responsibility to the function of production; and that it should be studied with equal intensity in order that the service may be performed with high efficiency, with great economy and with nothing more than a fair profit to the retailer. They recognized that to serve their own customers properly, the relations of the retailer to the producer must be fairly and scientifically adjusted; and, among other things, that it was the concern of the retailer to know whether the goods which he sold were manufactured under conditions which were fair to the workers—fair as to wages, hours of work and sanitary conditions.

But the Filenes recognized particularly their obligations to their own employees. They found as the common and accepted conditions in large stores, that the employees had no voice as to the conditions or rules under which they were to work; that the employees had no appeal from policies prescribed by the management; and that in the main they were paid the lowest rate of wages possible under competitive conditions.

In order to insure a more just arrangement for those working in their establishment, the Filenes provided three devices:

First. A system of self-government for employees, administered by the store co-operative association. Working through this association, the employees have the right to appeal from and to veto policies laid down by the management. They may adjust the conditions under which employees are to work, and, in effect, prescribe conditions for themselves.

Second. A system of arbitration, through the operation of which individual employees can call for an adjustment of differences that may exist between themselves and the management as to the permanence of employment, wages, promotion or conditions of work.

Third. A minimum wage scale, which provides that no woman or girl shall work in their store at a wage less than eight dollars a week, no matter what her age may be or what grade of position she may fill.

The Filenes have thus accepted and applied the principles of industrial democracy and of social justice. But they have done more—they have demonstrated that the introduction of industrial democracy and of social justice is at least consistent with marked financial success. They assert that the greater efficiency of their employees shows industrial democracy and social justice to be money-makers. The so-called "practical business man," the narrow money-maker without either vision or ideals, who hurled against the Filenes, as against McElwain, the silly charge of being "theorists," have been answered even on his own low plane of material success.

McElwain and the Filenes are of course exceptional men; but there are in America today many with like perception and like spirit. The paths broken by such pioneers will become the peopled highways. Their exceptional methods will become accepted methods. Then the term "Big business" will lose its sinister meaning, and will take on a new significance. "Big business" will then mean business big not in bulk or power, but great in service and grand in manner. "Big business" will mean professionalized business, as distinguished from the occupation of petty trafficking or mere money-making. And as the profession of business develops, the great industrial and social problems expressed in the present social unrest will one by one find solution.

From "Business a Profession," Small Maynard & Company, Inc. By permission of the author and publishers.

THE FRAME OF MIND

ROSCOE POUND

Roscoe Pound, since 1916 Dean of the School of Law, Harvard University, was born in Lincoln, Nebraska, 1870. He was graduated from the University of Nebraska and the Harvard Law School, returned to the middle West to practise, and for many years also held professorships of law in mid-western universities. Dean Pound has contributed variously to the encouragement of natural science. He was Director of the Botanical Survey of Nebraska, 1892–1903, and has written much on botany, though these writings are less known than his widely read texts on law.

The address quoted here was delivered in London, in the Middle Temple, on the evening of July 21, 1924, at a dinner given to the members of the American Bar Association by the Treasurer and Members of the Bench of the Honourable Society of the Middle Temple.

My Lord, Ladies and Gentlemen:—It has been said many times today, and will be said many times in the next few days, that we are here by the token of a common blood, a common speech, common political institutions, and a common law. Yet, since Americans parted politically with the Mother Country one hundred and fifty years ago, on our side of the water that common blood has been much diluted, and that common speech, one might say, has been unconventionalized, at least in America. Those common political institutions had already begun to diverge before the revolution. The events of 1688 made the Legislature supreme in England, but our colonial polity led us in our constitutions to preserve the institutions of Tudor and Stuart England, with a co-equal legislative, executive and judicial, governing together if they could, governing in spite of each other if they must. So that the enduring point has been the common law, and no phenomenon, I suppose, in our national life has been so marked as the persistence and vitality of that common law.

Only historians know that the custom of Paris was once law in Wisconsin, Illinois and Michigan. Only historians realize that over the great dominion of the Louisiana purchase the Roman Law once obtained, at least in theory. In the domain which we obtained from Mexico only a few disappearing curiosities in the law of property remain to show that that was once the domain of another system. Yet, if a stranger were to ask us exactly in what this unity of law consists I suspect that we should be hard put to it to convince him. The books on which that law was based—Coke's Institutes and Blackstone's Commentaries—have ceased to be studied, I suspect, on either side of the water. Scarcely a vestige of the old formal, over-refined procedure, and the feudal land law as found in Blackstone obtain on the other side of the water. That part of Coke's Institutes which is still living with us in our decisions upon our bills of rights ceased to be of importance in England, at least so far as legislation was concerned, with the sovereignty of Parliament after 1688. It is true there are a few American jurisdictions where we still crave oyer, where replications *de injuria* are filed, and where new assignments flourish; but nearly everywhere that sort of learning is as dead as it has been in England since 1873. To show you how far we have diverged in the matter of property, it is enough to say that in England today lands devolve upon the personal representative, and in at least one American jurisdiction personal property devolves upon the heir. A great mass of new subjects have arisen for which one would look in vain in the pages of Blackstone or of Coke, and in those subjects frequently the diversity is as notable as the similarity. Yet, out of all that diversity and all that similarity, there are three points that stand out. In England and in America the law is ascertained, and the law is developed judicially and professionally, whereas in the rest of the world it is ascertained by legislation and developed academically. In England and the United States we have a traditional art of deciding cases on the basis of the recorded judicial experience of the past, whereas in the rest of the world cases are decided by a technique of applying written texts. But, most of all, in England and in the United States we look at questions judicially, whereas in the rest of the world they are looked at, if I may say so, administratively; and behind those three points I venture to think is a common frame of mind, a frame of mind which we have inherited from the Middle Ages, which thinks of law as something not made, but found, and thinks of the quest for law as a quest for the justice and truth of the Creator. That is the frame of mind which led the judges in the Middle Ages to tell Edward III that, though he could pardon an offender under his Great Seal as King of England, he could not write a private letter as Edward Plantagenet to the sheriff and interfere with the due course of justice. It is that frame of mind which led the judges of Henry VII, when Parliament enacted a statute that derogated from what were then regarded as the fundamentals of the social order, to say that it was "impertinent to be observed." It was that frame of mind that led the judges to say to James I that he could not sit upon the Bench and decide in person cases affecting the fortune or inheritance of his subjects. It is that frame of mind that has led courts in the United States within a generation to remind sovereign legislatures and sovereign peoples that they, too, rule under God and the law. In that frame of mind we have something which is enduring while law books become obsolete and statutes are repealed—something permanent and unrepealable. I say to you that in that frame of mind we have a ground of unity beside which treaties, covenants, and alliances will prove but fleeting.

By permission of the author.

THE SCIENCE OF BUSINESS

ELBERT H. GARY

Elbert H. Gary, noted industrialist, was born near Wheaton, Illinois. Following his public school education, he attended Wheaton College and the University of Chicago, where he received the degree of LL.B. The degree of LL.D. was given him by Lafayette College, Lincoln Memorial University, Trinity College, and Syracuse University; the degree of Sc.D. by the University of Pittsburgh. After practicing law for twenty-five years in Chicago, Mr. Gary became identified with the United States Steel Corporation, serving, before his death August 15, 1927, as chairman of the board of directors and chairman of the finance committee of that organization. The speech given here was delivered by Mr. Gary at New York University, September 21, 1925.

President Harding said: "Business is the biggest thing in the world." In substance this is true. If we should say it is one of the biggest things we would be strictly accurate.

Success in business is fundamental to our existence. In its largest sense, it is connected with every occupation or calling in life, including the professions. The statesman, the clergyman, the head of an educational institution or a professor, the physician or surgeon, the dentist, the lawyer, the artist, the scientist, the merchant, the financier, the manufacturer, the artisan, the miner, the workman, are all more or less dependent upon the results of personal business efficiency and effort for the best performance and accomplishment of their duties and obligations. Education alone or mental capacity will not adequately provide the necessities of life, unless there is possessed some practical business ability; reasons for this assertion will occur to every intelligent individual.

In this brief discussion the subject will be limited to occupation or employment habitually engaged in especially for livelihood or gain.

The School of Commerce is established and maintained because it is realized that the interchange of business is essential to the protection and prosperity of the individual, the State and the Nation.

The requisites of business success are not a new discovery. They are simple and generally known and understood; but they are not always totally acknowledged, adopted or applied by the business man. In fact, some of them are ignored, if not defied, by many on the supposition that temporary advantage or gain, without regard to permanent results, is a justification; and they need to be recalled and emphasized.

Science itself is simple, for it is accumulated and accepted knowledge, however discovered, systematized and formulated with reference to fundamental truths or the operation of general laws.

If, then, the young man is desirous of succeeding in the effort to acquire a living or a competency for himself or others who depend or rely upon him, obviously he should carefully consider how best to fulfill his obligations to himself and others.

He should at the outset determine in what way he can popularize himself or his business; how he can make himself agreeable and approachable to those with whom he comes into business contact. Everyone has a choice of persons and place in regard to intercourse that involves any kind of business, and selection is made depending upon desirability, confidence and advantage. If one is seeking customers in any department of human activities, one should do everything reasonable to attract attention and then supply what is wanted. To do this, one should adopt and conscientiously apply certain standards of propriety. Included in the rules for guidance are many things which should go without saying.

First of all, of course, a man should have a good education. He should be well grounded in the rudiments, including spelling, writing, grammar, arithmetic, history and geography. A good college education, including the classics, will be advantageous. Knowledge of foreign languages is advisable. In fact, the more he knows of that which is taught in schools, colleges and universities of a general character, the better it will be for him in commencing business. If he has determined upon the calling he expects to adopt, he should pay particular attention to that subject while he is at school. Especially should he, if possible, take a course in the commerical department of a good institution of learning, if he intends to engage in commercial activities. Many things are taught in these departments which are practical and exceedingly helpful for the business man.

One should select an occupation or business with great care and thoughtful consideration, and then stick to it, and push it in every legitimate manner, without change, unless for good reason and a certainty of better results. When one has decided upon a business or profession, it is wise to concentrate and not scatter so far as one's personal activities are concerned. It is better to have one line of business well attended to than to have a number that are more or less neglected. Many bad failures result from ignoring this plain principle of economics. As to investments, if one can afford to make them, it is admissible to distribute them provided they do not require personal attention, and if the business involved is under the management of others known to be competent, honest and successful. One ought not to borrow money in order to make an investment or for any purpose whatever unless there is a certainty that it can be paid when it becomes due without sacrifice to one's individual business or capital. The most successful in business are those who have persistently devoted their personal time and attention to the concentration and improvement of one line of activity.

Then a man should always, so far as practicable, be absolutely clean and healthy, mentally, morally and physically. His habits should be above reproach. There may be a good excuse for not having the best of furnishings or dress. There can be none for not being clean. He ought to know himself; to study himself, to look into his own heart and mind and conscience. This for his own good and also because everyone he meets will respect him and enjoy his company. He carries with him evidence of a clear conscience and a desire to regard the feelings of others. To the extent that he cares for the proprieties as applied to himself he shows that he considers the interests and susceptibilities of others. A clean and healthy man will be better liked, more readily trusted. At the first meeting with another he begins to establish a good reputation. These qualities speak loudly and convincingly.

A man should be diligent, never intentionally negligent. He should keep his appointments punctually and fulfill his promises. He should, by study and what is even better, by careful thought, furnish the best of whatever is to be provided in goods, in advice or in service. There is no jusification for unnecessarily offering anything that is second-class. If on any occasion it should be impossible to provide what is the best of its kind, it would be advisable to frankly state the fact and the reason.

Every man should, so far as humanly possible, be up-to-date in everything pertaining to his occupation; and should be fully informed concerning the best and the latest development.

A man should be reasonable, fair, patient, and in all respects maintain and exercise a good disposition toward every other person. He should endeavor to make friends and avoid making enemies. This includes competitors, teachers and students, clients and customers, employees and employers, borrowers and lenders, and the general public. He should not live for himself alone. He should acknowledge and practice the principles of the Golden Rule.

He should be a loyal, patriotic, citizen, devoted to country, respectful to public officials and faithful in the observance of all laws so long as they exist. Such a man will be entitled to and will secure the respect and confidence of all others, emphatically those with whom he comes into business communication.

Much of large business is negotiated. Many of the biggest commercial transactions result from discussions between two or more persons, dealing at arm's length, having no fixed prices or exact basis for measuring or valuing, and depending entirely upon reaching an agreement which is mutually satisfactory, or at least acceptable. Neither side is under moral obligation to expose what is in the mind as an ultimatum or maximum. In such cases there is no reason for disclosure of the mental operations, though of course there can be no justification for misrepresentation or fraud of any kind. Here is opportunity for discretion and sagacity. A wise father used to say to his sons: "Remember, as you go through life, every man you meet in business is a little smarter than you." This idea is worth remembering.

The average man talks too much, especially if he has a good command of language. It is well to let the other man talk half the time. Each one is trying to "size up" the other before naming figures or stating final conclusions. "A wise man keeps a close mouth." In an extended discussion the experienced and wise man, if he is a good listener, is able to determine with considerable accuracy, something of what is in the mind of the other man. One should carefully weigh every word that is uttered by oneself and by the other person as well, and in doing so can also form an intelligent opinion of the integrity of the other and the reliability of a statement that the offer made is the "last dollar" that will be paid or accepted, as the case may be.

Thus it will be noted, on reflection, that one can be truthful and specific in a business transaction, and perhaps at the same time save a good deal of money by silence and discretion. Also, it is seen how much larger salary a man can earn, and will probably receive, if he is patient, wise and well educated. It is well for a young man to listen to negotiations in big transactions by experienced elders if opportunity is presented.

Last of the qualities to be mentioned at this time and as of the highest importance and consequence, a man, whatever his occupation, should be absolutely honest. Akin to honesty is accuracy in representation and statement. His word should be as good as his bond. If he is a statesman, clergyman, instructor, doctor, lawyer, dentist, artist, financier, merchant, manufacturer, artisan, miner, workman, or is engaged in any other occupation, and has firmly established a reputation for being unqualifiedly and uninterruptedly honest, he is thereby possessed of a large capital, which gives him a decided advantage over others whose reputation for integrity is in question. If one is desirous of consulting or transacting business, or is seeking employment of any kind, the perfectly honest and truthful person is first selected, all other things being equal. This is the rule, and there are few, if any exceptions. You may sometimes hear the contrary of what has been urged. Occasionally a man believed to be dishonest has appeared to be pecuniarily successful in business, temporarily at least, but almost invariably, if not always, it is not real success, or is much less than it otherwise would have been. As business is the biggest thing, or one of the biggest things, in the world, honesty is surely the biggest thing in business.

Abraham Lincoln, "Honest Abe," would not have been a success as President except for his reputation for honesty. In the earlier months of his service as President, he was bitterly, outrageously assailed by his enemies, and by some who professed to be and should have been his friends; but because he was honest and had confidence in his own integrity of purpose, and had demonstrated to his old acquaintances many times that he was honest and fair and truthful, his reputation was established and he triumphed over every charge of dishonesty. Notwithstanding the great volume of business which is connected with governmental administration, especially in war times, few persons, if any, ever charged Lincoln with being dishonest with regard to the Government's business or otherwise. With all his mentality, his ability to clearly and beautifully express his thoughts, and his unbounded sympathy towards those who suffered, his greatest quality was his instinctive, unswerving honesty. We have today in this country leading statesmen who likewise are thoroughly honest, and they will succeed to their satisfaction and ours.

It is deemed appropriate to mention the name of Marshal Field, "The Merchant Prince of Chicago," who died a score of years since, leaving more than $100,000,000, a large part of it for the public welfare. He started business life with very little, if any, money or property capital, but he built up a reputation for being unqualifiedly honest and exact; and he was all of that, as many of us know to a certainty. Every person at any time desiring anything Field sold, went there because he knew every price was based on quality and service, and that every promise to return the cash if anything proved to be wrong would be fulfilled. Also, every representation made by Field in his enormous purchases for his business was accepted and relied upon. From the beginning of his business career, his promise at any bank where he was known would secure whatever money he needed. There was no exception to his honesty, nor any limit to the credit which he secured by reason of it. Anything Field advocated in civic affairs of his great city, in financial or other matters, the people generally would support.

J. Pierpont Morgan, who was at the head of the largest banking institution of its kind in this country for many years preceding his death, which occurred in March, 1913, is another conspicuous example of an honest and truthful man. His testimony before the Pujo Committee at Washington clearly disclosed his description and opinion of an honest man. Mr. Morgan, in considering the advisability of loaning even large sums of money, paid more attention to the character and reputation of the proposed borrower than to the collaterals which were offered as security.

Mr. Morgan was a leader in finance in this and other countries for many years. His advice would generally be accepted and his course usually followed by other bankers. He stood at the very pinnacle of financiers. He left a large fortune, not so great by many millions as it might have been, because he made large contributions for worthy purposes that were not generally known.

He had a strong will and was insistent in having his own way concerning affairs with which he was connected, when he felt he was right; but he had a broad mind and tender heart, and he was very susceptible to arguments, especially such as appealed to his honor.

These three men were conspicuous examples and are selected for purposes of illustration. They were each unostentatious and modest, universally respected and admired, but loved most by those who had the privilege of intimate acquaintanceship. They demonstrated that it pays in dollars and cents to be honest.

Science never conflicts with honesty and truth. If honesty and truth are in discord with a supposed scientific principle, then the latter must give way, for it is not science at all.

It is hoped those who listen will agree, after thoughtful consideration, that adoption of the suggestions made, practically applied in business of every kind, will pay not only in adding to one's comfort and happiness, but also in pecuniary results. If some should disagree in any particular, they possibly will find they are not in accord with the opinions of a large majority of experienced and successful business men.

Not because of her own ambition, but almost in spite of herself, this country has become financially and commercially the greatest of all the nations. A kind and merciful Providence has bestowed upon her unlimited advantages. Never before has the chance for progress and prosperity been so good. The one great drawback is lack of observance and enforcement of the laws of the land. There is just at present, to a noticeable extent, a spirit of indifference to the laws of God and man.

But it is to be remembered that the minority possessing this spirit is comparatively small. A minority is sometimes more intelligent and the nearer right, but a chronic minority, as a rule, is the more vicious though it may make the more noise. The great majority of the people of the United States of America is made up of religious, intelligent and law-abiding citizens, and the majority will control.

Never in our past history have our young men and young women had such fine opportunities for success in business; and as always, everywhere, in every line and department of human activity, there is an abundance of room at the top. Each one should diligently struggle to reach it. It is up to every man and woman to succeed or fail. There is no good excuse for failure.

THE VOLUNTARY NATURE OF THE LABOR MOVEMENT

SAMUEL GOMPERS

Samuel Gompers, who was born in England in 1850, was, from his fifteenth year, occupied with efforts to organize the working people. He came early to America and in 1881 was one of the founders of the Federation of Trades and Labor Unions, and was its president for three years. The culmination of his efforts came in 1886, when he founded the American Federation of Labor, of which he was president continuously (excepting the year 1895) until his death in 1925. He was also for many years editor of the Federation's official magazine, *The American Federationist*. His work became international. He was President of the Pan-American Federation of Labor, and in 1918–'19 attended the Peace Conference at Paris as president of the International Committee on Labor Legislation.

This address, which he prepared for the El Paso conference of the A. F. of L., he gave out as almost a last utterance, terming it a "Trade Union Creed."

FORTY-FOUR years ago in the city of Pittsburgh a group of labor men met to bring to fruition an effort extending over a period of years—to organize a national labor movement. We were a group of labor men with little experience in a national labor movement. We had to find our problems and devise ways of meeting them. There was little to guide us. The majority of us had a standing in our local trade unions and in our national trade organizations, but we had not joined hands with the representatives of other trade organizations in an effort to make the labor movement a force in the determination of national policies.

The National Labor Union, like previous similar labor efforts, had organized a labor party and then passed out of existence.

Industrialism growing out of constantly increasing invention of machinery, application of mechanical power which necessitated the factory system and the substitution of new materials for old, was making the need of economic protection for the workers, increasingly imperative. Those of us who had opportunity to observe tendencies felt the responsibility to our fellow workers to make the effort for protection and for future progress.

There were but few paid trade union officials in those days, but after the day's work was done, those with the vision and spirit of service gave the evening hours and holidays to the cause of betterment of their fellow workers. More frequently than not the office of trade union official was carried in his pocket and its code of laws in his heart and mind; benefits, even strike assistance, were irregular and undependable if provided at all; union dues and union rules varied from city to city, if not from shop to shop. The present trade union movement was then in the making—aye, had hardly begun.

But the men who constituted that Pittsburgh labor congress in 1881 were as brainy and resourceful a group as ever gathered; they were men who knew the joy and inspiration of service that entailed sacrifice. Service in the early trade union movement meant to become a marked man whom employers were reluctant to hire and who was discharged first; whose family must forego the comforts and often the necessaries of life; upon whose children the handicap attaching to the name of a "labor agitator" fell.

These very conditions of service in the labor movement assured the cause selected men of unusual qualities. They were men of self-respect and character.

When the Pittsburgh labor congress set itself to the task of planning an organization, it studied the British Trades Union Congress, drafted a similar plan and organized the Federation of Trades and Labor Unions of the United States and Canada. In our optimism we thought that we had settled our economic problems and that we needed only to consider the field of labor legislation. We elected as our executive, a legislative committee, but provided no salaries, no permanent office, no full-time representatives. From year to year we met, accomplishing a little but keeping alive the thought of national organization and calling attention to the needs of the workers, until there came a crucial contest in which the existence of trade unions was threatened. Then the trade unions sent out the warning of danger and sent a small group to carry by word of mouth a message to rouse labor. Again in 1886 a national labor conference was called. This time it was designated a trade union conference to be composed of representatives of trade unions and to consider trade union problems. The deliberations of that conference resulted in the formation of our present American Federation of Labor with which the old Federation of Trades and Labor Unions was merged. This new federation recognized only the trade union card as a credential and proposed to deal primarily with economic problems. It was an organization that had no power and no authority except of a voluntary character. It was a voluntary coming together of unions with common needs and common aims. That feeling of mutuality has been a stronger bond of union than could be welded by any autocratic authority. Guided by voluntary principles our Federation has grown from a weakling into the strongest, best organized labor movement of all the world.

So long as we have held fast to voluntary principles and have been actuated and inspired by the spirit of service, we have sustained our forward progress and we have made our labor movement something to be respected and accorded a place in the councils of our Republic. Where we have blundered into trying to force a policy or a decision, even though wise and right, we have impeded, if not interrupted, the realization of our own aims.

But the very success of our organization has brought additional and serious dangers. Office in the labor movement now offers opportunity for something in addition to service—it offers opportunity for the self-seeker who sees an instrumentality for personal advancement, both in the economic and in the political field. There are serious problems confronting us. Wisdom and conviction are necessary to wise decisions.

Men and women of our American trade union movement, I feel that I have earned the right to talk plainly with you. As the only delegate to that first Pittsburgh convention who has stayed with the problems of our movement through to the present hour, as one who with clean hands and with singleness of purpose has tried to serve the labor movement honorably and in a spirit of consecration to the cause of humanity, I want to urge devotion to the fundamentals of human liberty—the principles of voluntarism. No lasting gain has ever come from compulsion. If we seek to force, we but tear apart that which, united, is invincible. There is no way whereby our labor movement may be assured sustained progress in determining its policies and its plans other than sincere democratic deliberation until a unanimous decision is reached. This may seem a cumbrous, slow method to the impatient, but the impatient are more concerned for immediate triumph than for the education of constructive development.

Our movement has found these voluntary principles the secure foundation upon which the workers of all America make united effort, for our voluntary co-operation has ignored lines of political division separating the United States and Canada, because economically we are a unit. Because we refused to be bound by arbitrary restrictions or expedients we have fostered cohesive forces which give play to the finer and more constructive faculties of the people of both countries. We are eager to join in an international labor movement based upon the same principles of voluntarism. We are willing to co-operate if we can be assured a basis that will enable us to maintain our integrity—a condition necessary for our own virility and continued progress.

Understanding, patience, high-minded service, the compelling power of voluntarism have in America made what was but a rope of sand, a united, purposeful, integrated organization, potent for human welfare, material and spiritual. I have been with this movement since the beginning, for I have been given the privilege of service that has been accorded but few. Nor would that privilege have continued open to me had not service to the cause been my guiding purpose.

Events of recent months made me keenly aware that the time is not far distant when I must lay down my trust for others to carry forward. When one comes to close grips with the eternal things there comes a new sense of relative values and the less worthy things lose significance. As I review the events of my sixty years of contact with the labor movement and as I survey the problems of today and study the opportunities of the future, I want to say to you, men and women of the American labor movement, do not reject the corner-stone upon which labor's structure has been builded—but base your all upon voluntary principles and illumine your every problem by consecrated devotion to that highest of all purposes—human well-being in the fullest, widest, deepest sense.

We have tried and proved these principles in economic, political, social and international relations. They have been tried and not found wanting. Where we have tried other ways, we have failed.

A very striking illustration is emphasized by circumstances connected with the present location of our convention. For years force and selfish interests dominated relations across this international border, but the labor movement brought to an acute and difficult situation the spirit of patience and the desire of service and a transformation has been brought which gives us courage and conviction for wider application of the same principles. As we move upward to higher levels, a wider vision of service and responsibility will unfold itself. Let us keep the faith. There is no other way.

By permission of R. Lee Guard.

CHRISTIAN CHARITY

PATRICK CARDINAL HAYES

Patrick Cardinal Hayes, Archbishop of New York, was born in New York in 1867. He was ordained a Roman Catholic priest in 1892; received the degree of D.D. in Rome in 1904; was appointed Archbishop of New York, 1919; and was created Cardinal in 1924.

This address was delivered over the radio, Sunday evening, April 26, 1925.

As head of the archdiocese of New York, with its million and more of Catholic people, I desire to express our sincere appreciation to the officers of the American Telephone and Telegraph Company for their gracious courtesy in placing at the disposal of Catholic Charities, this evening, the service of WEAF and affiliated stations.

I am likewise keenly sensitive to the presence of the vast invisible audience, not of my own religious faith, who think it worth while to give me their attention for a few brief moments.

Catholic Charities was organized five years ago, to supervise, co-ordinate, and improve the work of some two hundred agencies, societies, and institutions, covering the field of child welfare, health, protective care, and social action. Last year, these two hundred agencies expended nearly $8,000,000 and reached 181,000 individuals. The supervising organization, known as Catholic Charities, spent another million in carrying on its work.

One of the effects of modern scientific welfare work has been the attachment of a sinister connotation to the word charity, and as a consequence, its almost total elimination from the terminology of social work.

But the church knows no such debasement of the term. “God is charity,” she says with her Apostle John, “and he that abideth in charity abideth in God, and God in him.”

If charity is not God, and God not charity, the Church might wisely abandon the field of charity to secular organizations of social service, or to civic and state agencies of public welfare. These agencies, however commendable, cannot claim the spiritual quality of Christian charity. According to their own principle and practise, the defective, dependent, or delinquent human being should be healed, strengthened and reformed for the benefit of the social order and the public weal. Religion goes beyond and outside this philosophy of time.

The charity of Christ gives to human sympathy and help a heavenly touch and a spiritual power that reveal the Saviour so wonderfully human and man so sublimely divine. Christian charity is vitally concerned with the eternal as well as the temporal welfare of the individual—beloved as a creature of God, made in His image, and redeemed by the Precious Blood of His own Divine Son. The more mis-shapen the human form; the more loathsome the disease; the more distorted the mind; the more outcast the criminal the more reason for loving and saving the immortal soul so unfortunately housed in so wretched a prison of clay. To such as these Christ yearns to come as Father and Friend.

My message, essentially pastoral in its character, to my own flock, is not, I am sure, without an appeal to America, for the brotherhood of Christ-like charity, which Lincoln translated into a lofty American ideal when he said: "With malice toward none, with charity for all." Every true citizen should daily rededicate himself to that charity, which is kind, not puffed up, seeketh not its own, and thinketh no evil, rejoicing not in iniquity but with the truth.

While science is feverishly active in unfolding the secrets of nature, and industry is only second in its own urge to harness the gains of research and discovery for service and pleasure, the immortal soul grows more restless in seeking for an answer to the mystery of life and death. The radio, marvelous and inscrutable in a certain sense though it be, deepens the mystery and intensifies our awe. In the face of advanced science, however, the heavens above us have lost none of their majesty and splendor; the moaning of the homeless sea and the hungry maw of the stormy ocean are as terrifying as ever. The radio, I repeat, has immeasurably increased our wonderment, and to many hearts has revealed the sense of God's overshadowing presence in the universe. Such is my reflection as I speak through our modern trumpet of the air, which might well have been reserved by the Creator, not only in symbolism but in reality, to the ministry of angels, instead of to that of mere men.

Tonight, for the moment, the radio becomes a shepherd's horn, or, if you will, a shepherd's pipes calling to the sheep who know their shepherd's voice. Beethoven's inspiring symphony of pastoral music is meaningless compared with the Divine harmony of charity, broadcast tonight under the starry canopy of heaven, with this earth as God's footstool and the clouds as His chariot upon the wings of the wind. "God is charity" is written upon the skies and sounded upon the heights and depths of the air, for those who having eyes, see, and having ears, hear.

It is this spiritual sense of the Divine and the human which religion cultivates. Our modern civilization needs it badly. What would it profit America to gain the mastery of the world, even of the universe, in things material and temporal, and lose its soul? Progress, education, science, and unparalleled prosperity, of themselves, will not save us. Our greatness and bigness provoke enemies from without and create dangers from within. Ravenous wolves are ever threatening the fold of modern society, and even a lone wolf is never stayed from attacking the sheep because of the size of the flock. Irreligion is, perhaps, the one wolf our beloved country may well fear most. May God give us shepherds whose lives and teachings breathe His infinite love for all mankind.

Charity, practised by the many, is an essential element of true and abiding democracy. The Fatherhood of God and the brotherhood of man spring only from Divine and human charity. The real love of God means also the love of man; and the true love of man cannot be without the love of God. Communistic experiments invariably lead to terrorism, because of class hatred which drives out charity. Tyranny and injustice cannot live where charity abounds. The humblest and poorest in a real democracy enjoy not a man-made, but a God-given dignity, which no power but personal degradation can take from them. It is the exercise of charity by the multitude that will prevent paternalism of the state which might pauperize and that will save us from the over-bounty of philanthropy which might paralyze. A superabundance on the part of a few, makes a few large humanitarian foundations possible. Laudable though they be, the charity of God, which is within the gift of the multitude, is a treasure beyond all price, and is measured not by earth but by heaven, where neither the rust nor the moth consume, and where thieves do not break through, nor steal. When guided by such lofty principles, the wage-earner of limited means practises charity, he reaches a stature of dignified and splendid citizenship which makes him the equal, and, in view of his sacrifices, the superior of those who part only with their super-abundance.

Permit me here to read the following simple verses of Edgar A. Guest: "Lost Opportunities" (The Reilly & Lee Co., Chicago, publishers).

"When I am rich" he used to say,
"A thousand joys I'll give away:
I'll walk among the poor I find
And unto one and all be kind.
To all in need I'll friendly be
The day that fortune smiles on me."

He never guessed that being kind
Depends upon the heart and mind
And not upon the purse at all;
He never knew or understood
The fellowship of doing good.
Because he had not much to spare
He thought it vain to give his share.

Yet many passed him, day by day,
He might have helped along the way.

He fancied kindness something which
Belongs entirely to the rich.
And so he lived and toiled for gold,
Unsympathetic, harsh and cold,
Intending all the time to share
The burdens that his brothers bear
When he possessed great wealth, and he
Could well afford a friend to be.

His fortune came but, oh, too late;
The poor about him could not wait.
They never guessed and never knew
The things that he had meant to do.
Few knew how much he'd planned to give
If God had only let him live.
And when at last his form was cold,
All that he'd left on earth was gold.
A kindly name is something which
A man must earn before he's rich.

St. Bernard to such as make excuse for hesitancy or failure to serve because of meager talent or of small opportunity urges that service is not a question of giving what we have not, but one of giving of what we have: if much, give much: if little, then the little.

The Master, Himself, praises those who are faithful "in a little and over a few things," in keeping with their talents and means; but individual personal service is an evident duty for each one of us. The duty may not be always cast either in pleasant places. Charity more frequently than not calls us whither we rather would not go. It is human nature to plead with the poet:

I said, "Let me walk in the fields";
  The Master said, "Nay, walk in the town."
I said, "There are no flowers there":
  He said, "No flowers but a crown."
I said, "But the skies are black,
  There is nothing but noise and din."
But He wept as He sent me back;
  "There is more," He said, "There is sin!"

The striking feature of Catholic Charities is the universality and community of good-will and good deed on the part of nearly 300,000 active members, who regard it as a duty, a privilege and an honor to love God by loving their neighbor for His sake.

They are equally all American because of the inherent and positive benediction their charity brings upon our beloved land which they yearn to see flower and flourish under God's holy care, while they pray that our flag may ever remain without spot or stain—a standard and symbol of peace, security, happiness, justice and charity.

By permission of the author.

SPEECH PLACING IN NOMINATION FOR THE PRESIDENCY OF THE UNITED STATES GOVERNOR ALFRED E. SMITH

FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT

Franklin D. Roosevelt, lawyer, and present Governor of New York State, was formerly a member of the New York State Senate, assistant Secretary of the Navy under President Wilson, and, in 1920, Democratic nominee for Vice-President of the United States. He was born in Hyde Park, New York, in 1882, and holds degrees from Columbia and Harvard universities.

This address, delivered at the Democratic National Convention in Madison Square Garden, New York, June, 1924, is an excellent example of a speech of nomination.

Fellow Delegates: Let me at the outset thank my neighbors in Connecticut for their courtesy in yielding to me. And let me at the same time say in behalf of the New York delegation that we expect that the guests of this Convention will render the same fair play to all candidates and their friends as we would expect to receive in any other city.

To meet again so many friends whom I have not seen since the last Democratic national gathering gives me a thrill of pleasure. At that Convention, where I myself received one of the highest honors of the party, I had the privilege of working and speaking on behalf of the then Governor of New York. Today, four years later, I carry the same mission, presenting the same Governor, a man in whose behalf the best argument is the man himself.

At San Francisco, you who were there came to know him as one greatly loved by his State, whose personality and picturesque rise to high office produced as you will remember a spontaneous wave of good feeling among the delegates from every section of our land. Today he has become more than a favorite son. He is known throughout the nation as one of the real leaders, of whom millions of Americans regardless of party are proud. It has been suggested that we would attempt to sweep him through to victory at this Convention upon a wave of emotional appeal. Let me assure you at the outset that I shall make no such endeavor.

In the very suggestion, however, there is tribute to the strength of this man. There is no need for me to portray the profound love which goes out to him from every class and every section of the community. If you would know what the hearts of the masses hold for him, ask anyone; when you leave this session ask the woman who serves you in the shop; the banker who cashes your check; the man who runs your elevator; the clerk in your hotel; men, women and children, rich or poor, high or low; and you will be told with a convincing unanimity that first in the affections of the people of this state, first far above all others and the power of all others to attain, is the man who has been twice honored with election to the governorship of the State of New York. And this is true of men and women not only in this state, but in every part of the Union where his name has come to be a symbol for honesty, for deep understanding and for splendid service to the people.

These are factors, this is evidence which you as judges, or rather as a great jury of fourteen hundred assembled here to render an unbiased verdict, must take into account. You are stewards of a sacred trust. To you has been given the solemn, two-fold duty of setting forth anew the principles of our party and of choosing a standard bearer who will at once give the greatest assurance of ability to perform the functions of the Chief Executive, and the greatest assurance of victory.

To be true to that trust, we must be true to ourselves, and put from our hearts and minds every sordid consideration, every ignoble personal prejudice, and every individual allegiance to anything whatsoever other than the sacred principle upon which our country and our party stands. So, in our final action we shall put aside any appeal to any passion or to any prejudice.

Our declaration of principles will unite every Democrat and convince the men and women voters of the United States that the time is at hand when the guidance of our government is to be entrusted to the hands of a Democratic President and a Democratic Congress. The depths to which our federal government has fallen have been well portrayed to you by my old friends, the temporary and the permanent chairmen of this Convention. Corruption in government is and will be one of the overshadowing issues. Our candidate must be able to stand upon that. Make no mistake, the country will remember that, and the country will remember, too, that on our Governor for over twenty years in public office the white light of publicity has pitilessly beaten, and revealed only spotless integrity. Save for those whose enmity is a badge of honor, he has no enemies, and his bitterest political adversaries have never charged him with the slightest deviation from the highest standard of political and ethical morality and the highest ideals of responsibility.

And there is another phase. The country cries out in consternation and contempt over the continued dissensions between the executive and the legislative branches of the government during the last four years. In theory our Constitution provides a system of checks and balances. Under the complete lack of leadership in a Republican White House and a Republican Capitol, we have had all of the checks but none of the balances.

Therefore we must give to the country a President experienced in administration and capable of restoring team work and good will between the Executive and the Congress. These qualifications are rare, but I submit to you no experiment. This man's record is history; it has brought the highest commendation from the citizens of this state, men and women, Republican and Democrat, farmer and city dweller alike. That record was made doubly significant in his first term as Governor when he faced a legislature wholly controlled by the opposite party, and again in his second term when he faced a Republican Assembly.

His ability to persuade and co-operate without abandonment of principle—the very essence of leadership—proves that his inauguration as President would mark the beginning of a new era of good feeling and practical accomplishment between the President and the Congress of the United States.

Nor can the disgraceful shortcomings of our federal government be explained by cynics and pessimists who declare that the conduct of public business cannot approach the efficiency of private business. With this view I take determined issue. Here in this state, through the leadership of this governor, governmental efficiency has so increased that the executives of other states have done us the honor of seeking to copy our model. He was a pioneer for the budget system. He was a pioneer in the reorganization and simplification of governmental departments. Through it all he has held up and strengthened the system of promotion in the government service for merit only, and the appointment to public office of men and women pre-eminently qualified for their tasks. Because of his ideals and methods of government, he has won not only the undivided support of his own party but the public endorsement of great civic non-partisan bodies of the city and state.

Give this man the opportunity of wider service. I guarantee he will make the dry bones rattle in Washington, and that no longer will cynics and pessimists point the finger of scorn at our executive machinery. And that machine under his directive force will function not only well but always forward in the vital service of humanity—and that spells the true progressive.

I have had the good fortune to visit every state of the Union. I can understand and appreciate the just pride which you men and women from the West and South feel in the accomplishments of your progressive leaders. But we, too, under the inspiration of our Governor have been in the van of progress for humanity. Always his mind has been concerned with the condition of the less fortunate.

Under his guiding hand our State has recognized by its statutes that its most priceless asset is the life and health of its women and children. He obtained laws prohibiting night work for women and the employment of small children. He secured state pensions for widowed mothers, and state aid for the promotion of the health of rural communities. That is progressive! He has sponsored a practical Workmen's Compensation Law, and has established Labor Boards to mediate disputes between employer and employee; he was responsible for the best factory laws ever passed in any state. That is progressive! Under his leadership, co-operative marketing, the extension of state highways, built for miles, not votes, the diversification of crops and the reforestation of denuded lands have marched hand in hand. That is progressive!

In his first term as Governor, every penny of additional appropriation went to the extension of the educational system of the state, and the public schools have increased in their facilities and in their standard of teaching and scholarship more than at any previous time. This is progressive! But with all this, the efficiency of his administrative department has been such that he was able to point the way for the recent action of Congress by reducing the income tax of this state by twenty-five per cent and the direct tax on land values throughout the state by another twenty-five per cent—a total of $17,000,000. That is progressive, too.

The most pronounced ill from which the country suffers today is a lack of confidence in government. This loss of faith arises chiefly from the reprehensible acts, the low conception of duty and the complete lack of leadership of those now in power. We need as President one in whom the masses of the people, the great cross-section of American public opinion, will regain their lost faith. We need as President not a man who will satisfy some one section or some one class; the relations of labor and capital, the farmer and the city dweller, the manufacturer and consumer, the rich and poor, have become so complex in our national life that problems have arisen acute beyond the dreams of our forefathers, and calling for the steady guiding hand of one whose voice will be heeded by the vast majority of those who make up the 110,000,000 of our population.

Confidence and faith such as this has been won by the Governor of this State. The masses of labor look to him as a protector and good friend. The honest business man knows that he has never sought personal preferment by demagogic attack on honest business. The farmers who in this State raise crops valued at hundreds of millions of dollars bear willing testimony to his years of service in their behalf, aiding them to better living conditions and a more economic distribution of the produce of the farm. This faith in him, and in his fundamental rugged honesty, this knowledge of his intuitive ability to go down to the heart of any problem, to offer solutions understood by, and for the ultimate good of, the average man and woman—these are the reasons why this man above all others will bring order out of chaos in the national capital, and will renew the respect and esteem in which our government should be held by the people whom it serves.

Republicans may have to go up and down the country explaining that they are, after all, in favor of the Constitution of the United States. Such action on our part is unnecessary. His is a record of law enforcement. He believes that our Constitution needs no explaining. His record of twenty years as public servant proves that he stands on the Constitution from the first article to the seventh, and from the first amendment to the nineteenth, inclusive.

With him we can win. This Governor of ours is the most dangerous adversary that the Republican party ever had to fear, and you, in Convention here assembled, owe it to the nation to choose a candidate whose name spells victory. He has been elected to office seventeen times. Chosen Governor of this State first in 1918, he suffered the only defeat of his long career in 1920. But it was a defeat more glorious than victory. When our national ticket in the State of New York went down to defeat under a plurality of one million one hundred thousand votes, he lost this State by only 74,000. He got one million votes more than I did—and I take off my hat to him! Over 500,000 people who voted the Republican national ticket split their ballots to testify their undying confidence in this Democratic Governor; and in 1922, when men came again to think clearly and to reason sanely, when the black clouds of group hatred had been swept away, when sordid appeals to class and race had lost their evil spell, the people of this State rose again in their might and re-elected him Governor by a plurality of 384,945, the largest plurality ever given any candidate for Governor in the history of the United States. This is an overwhelming demonstration of ability to command the confidence of the great electorate. This record of his is the talk of citizens in every state, and when you give him the opportunity to appear before the larger electorate of the Union, the result in New York will be repeated by a vast majority of commonwealths which go to make up our nation.

But there are other reasons for this demonstrated success. All the world loves a man who carves his own career. Much of the romance of Lincoln is in the life story of our Governor. Born of American-born parents he took upon his shoulders while still a boy the responsibility for the support of his family. A wage-earner, toiling with his hands, this man in the space of 20 years, without fortune, without fortuitous aid, with nothing to rely upon except his own indomitable courage, his own unflagging perseverance, his own magnificent ability, has risen to be a commanding and outstanding figure in the life of the nation. This he has done not with the art of a demagogue, not with the wiles of a trickster, but with a dignity, a knowledge and a wisdom that demonstrated him a statesman. Can you conceive a career more appealing to the imagination or to the affections, more calculated to give hope and confidence to those who, in these trying times, have sometimes doubted the efficacy of American institutions.

It was the illustrious Woodrow Wilson, my revered Chief and yours, who said, "The great voice of America does not come from the university. It comes in a murmur from the hills and the woods, from the farms, the factories and the mills—rolling on and gaining volume until it comes to us from the homes of the common people."

Our Governor not only represents the common people—but he embodies in his very being the aspirations of the average man, so that when he speaks he speaks with the voice of America—he burns with the fire of a divine humanity—the fire which has produced the greatest of leaders of the democracies of the world.

Four years ago lying opponents said that the country was tired of ideals—they waged a campaign based on an appeal to prejudice—based on the dragging out of bogies and hobgoblins—the subtle encouragement of false fears. America has not lost her faith in ideals—idealism is of her very heart's blood. Tricked once we have been—millions of voters are waiting today for the opportunity next November to wreak their vengeance on those deceivers—they await the opportunity to support a man who will return America to the fold of Decency and Ideals from which she has strayed, and who will bring the government back to the people. This our candidate will do—his is the quality of militant leadership. He has the ability to campaign and to campaign in the highest and finest sense. He has the rare power to express the great fundamental truths and ideals in homely language carrying conviction to the multitude. He has a power to strike at error and wrongdoing that makes his adversaries quail before him. He has a personality that carries to every hearer not only the sincerity but the righteousness of what he says. He is the "Happy Warrior" of the political battlefield. Ask your Republican friends whom they would least like to see nominated by this convention. You will get an answer that will lead you to love the Governor of this State for the fear that he has thrown into the camp of our adversary. Picture the coming campaign —imagine ringing through the halls of this nation this man's denunciation of official corruption, of un-American isolation, of sordid tariffs for the benefit of the few, attacking as only he can, the Republican onslaught on the reserve powers of the States. Imagine his thrust and his genial sarcasm burning out the truth where all men can see it; the eloquence of his simple, clean-cut oratory; the wave of understanding and of belief in him which will follow his steps.

Picture to yourselves this campaign. You will see with me the consternation that his nomination will bring to the ranks of Republicanism and privilege, and the assurance of Democratic victory which his nomination will bring to the hosts of our own party.

I ask your judgment—I ask you to render it in the spirit of devotion to the principles of our party, in the faith that all citizens are equal before the law; in the conviction that the solid democracy of this nation will stand without fear and without hesitation loyally behind the nominee of this Democratic Convention.

If you will render your verdict in that sacred mood it can only be for the nomination of the man whom I present to you—the one above all others who has demonstrated his power, his ability to govern; this leader whose whole career gives convincing proof of his power to lead; this warrior whose record shows him invincible in defense of right and in attack on wrong; this man, beloved by all, trusted by all, respected by all; this man who all admit can bring us an overwhelming victory this year—this man of destiny whom our State proudly dedicates to the nation—our own Alfred E. Smith.

By permission of the author.

WELCOME TO THE DAUGHTERS OF THE AMERICAN REVOLUTION

WARREN G. HARDING

Warren Gamaliel Harding, twenty-ninth President of the United States, was born in Corsica, Ohio, in 1865. Always he was an Ohioan; and from his twentieth year until his death he was a newspaper man, of the town of Marion. His career as a statesman progressed steadily: State Senator, 1900–'4; Lieutenant-Governor of Ohio, 1904–'6; United States Senator from Ohio, 1915–'21; President of the nation, 1921 until his death in August, 1923.

This address was delivered at the Annual Convention of the D. A. R. at Memorial Continental Hall in Washington, April, 1923.

DAUGHTERS OF THE REVOLUTION: It is a great pleasure to greet and join in the welcome which the nation's Capital gladly extends to the notable body of enlightened and patriotic women who gather annually to renew their pledges of highest national usefulness.

I am sure that Washington rejoices in the presence and profits by its contact with an association wherein long ago you merged the finest aspirations for service and submerged every consideration of section, faction, ancient division and merely selfish ambition. It has been the uniform object of the Daughters of the Revolution to preserve and promote those sentiments of civic duty, of broadly national concern, of genuine patriotism, which constitute our richest inheritance from the fathers who laid the foundation of our national estate.

Our country will have done well when it is assured of the full enlistment of all the unselfish devotion of its womanhood in the supreme duty of implanting sentiments of real Americanism in the hearts of all our citizens. It is because your order has so long, so earnestly, so unswervingly led in enlisting womanhood for this splendid service that these yearly conventions are recognized as occasions of refreshment to the spiritual welfare and reinforcement to the physical reserves on which depend the national movement forward and upward. Yours is an unceasing, a self-perpetuating crusade. You seek constantly to draw in new armies of recruits to the forces which uphold the banners of exalted nationalism and of ennobling citizenship. Your service to country finds its recruits in the youth of the oncoming generation; it gains in strength through the training and discipline of these; it seeks always to expand and improve its ideals and aims through its efforts to open a wider and a truer vision to those who will be the leaders of tomorrow.

It is in this conception of your organization that, I think, we shall most justly appraise its usefulness to our country. You have made it your especial endeavor to train the rising generation in the ways of righteous and useful citizenship. In your zeal for a better tomorrow you have wrought greatly for a better today.

The Daughters of the Revolution have preserved for us all a lesson in the desirability of forbearance, patience and tolerance. In the beginnings of the nation there were wide divergences of judgment about institutions, methods, directions, means and measures. There were conflicts of sentiment, section and fundamental social procedures. Passions were often inflamed, and jealousy often was threatened. These conflicts required to be settled through mutual concessions, through generous recognition of inevitable and yet perfectly honest differences. Fortunately for our country's great experiment, there was a sufficient endowment of wisdom, moderation and selfishness to make possible the adjustment of all the differences. The great project of government of the people, for the people, by the people was sent forth in the world because no group or faction or narrow interest assumed to be or to represent all the people. No group arrogated to itself all the political righteousness of the young republic.

Because it has ever been the aim and object of your organization to keep this general attitude at the front among your policies, one is prompted to note the striking coincidence between the complexities of those early days in our history and the problems which the world confronts today. Never has mankind faced difficulties of such varied character, or on so huge a scale, as now propound to it the riddle of the Sphinx. The very destiny of the race, the future of civilization, seem to depend on our finding answer, and on our sincere, generous, broad-minded acceptance of that answer when it is found. Until the new paths are well revealed, we must hold secure those which we inherited. We shall not find an answer which will be completely satisfactory to any State, or race or people. But if we shall pursue our quest with open mind, and with purpose of achieving the largest benefit for the greatest number, I believe we shall in the end discover that we have attained also a large advantage for those who seemed to be making something of sacrifice to the common welfare.

Such was the spirit in which the fathers of our country reached the compromises which made this nation possible. It is the spirit which your organization has sought to inculcate among all the elements of the community, and to whose nurture you have contributed so generously and well. It is the spirit, I am sure, in which the world of today must attack the problems that beset its way toward realization of the higher destiny we all believe is in store for humanity.

It is good to recall the beginning. The war-torn world of today easily might find a helpful lesson and cheering encouragement therein. In a chaos of victory, prostrate in material fortunes, wrecked financially, with interests conflicting and ideas opposing, the founding fathers found a way to union and concerted effort to restoration and attainment. World wonder, sometimes world envy, has attended the astounding development. But there has come to us a glorious country, a cherished nationality, an inheritance which it is an inspiration to preserve, and we have the prospect of future advancement, for ourselves and helpfulness to the world, ever to impel America onward.

I can't resist telling it to you—it is only a few days since I had the extraordinary fortune to shake hands with a gentleman who told me his father knew George Washington. Isn't that a wonderful thing—that I could meet in 1923 an American whose father knew the founder of our Republic? It serves to remind you how brief is the span of time between the immortal beginning and the wonderful now.

On numerous occasions I have met granddaughters and grandsons of some of the immortal founders. I have met two granddaughters of Alexander Hamilton. Only three generations between the beginning and now—less than a century and a half! And yet, here in America, with so unpromising a beginning, we have come to the point when I think it no unseemly boast to say that America is one of the governmental marvels of the world—the highest type of democracy on earth.

It was the inspiration of the fathers—oh, I believe the founding was inspired. Somehow there were laid the broad principles, and there was given a beginning on which we Americans have builded, not for ourselves alone, but we have furnished an asylum of hope to the oppressed peoples of the world, and given them the opportunity to drink in the inspiration of American freedom, to embrace the offerings of American opportunity, to stand exalted amid the rights and privileges of American citizenship.

We have never been remiss except in one thing—I speak of it now because I rejoice in your efforts to correct that remissness—we offered much and we asked too little. It is not right for anybody on earth to have the fortunes, the privileges, the favors, and the opportunities of American citizenship without assuming every duty and every obligation thereof. No; I do not see how any American can escape a sense of satisfaction in contemplating this great plan, and if I had one word to say on this happy occasion—and it is a very great and pleasing occasion to me—I want America to preserve the things that came to us, and then in the best conscience of the republic to go on for ourselves and to play our part in helping humanity forward throughout the world.

By permission of *The Daughters of the American Revolution Magazine.*

ADDRESS AT THE UNVEILING OF A MONUMENT TO CHIEF JUSTICE SALMON P. CHASE

WILLIAM H. TAFT

William Howard Taft, twenty-seventh President of the United States, former Chief Justice of the Supreme Court of the United States, the only man in the history of this country to have filled both offices, was born in Cincinnati, Ohio, September 15, 1857. He was graduated with honor from Yale in 1878 and from the Cincinnati Law School in 1880. After a distinguished career in Ohio, where he served in high judicial capacities, he was appointed first civil governor of the Philippine Islands, then Secretary of War in President Roosevelt's cabinet. His term as President closed in 1913. In 1921 he accepted appointment as Chief Justice of the Supreme Court of the United States, resigning because of poor health shortly before his death, March 8, 1930.

The address quoted here was delivered before the American Bar Association gathered at the monument in Cincinnati, July, 1924.

THE American Bar Association performs an appropriate and pleasing duty thus to perpetuate the memory of Chief Justice Chase in the city of his professional life. American lawyers are widely distributed through forty-eight States, and are separated by their practice into as many different systems of courts. The only Court in which they all stand on an equality, and in which not only the Constitution and laws of the Nation, but also those of all the States, are enforced, is the Supreme Court of the United States. In that Court they all should feel equally at home. It is the only Court in the country of which this can be said. They do well then, as a national profession, to preserve the name and confirm the greatness of a man who by his nine years' work, as the head of that Court, left a deep and lasting mark upon our Federal constitutional law.

Salmon Portland Chase was born in the rugged hills of New Hampshire, in January, 1808. He was one year older than

Lincoln. An uncle, a missionary Bishop of the Episcopal Church, brought him, when he was but twelve years old, to Ohio, where he spent three years at collegiate schools, one of them in Cincinnati. Returning to New Hampshire, he entered Dartmouth in the junior year and took his Bachelor's degree in 1826, when he was but eighteen. He acquired his collegiate education by the hardest. He earned his way by teaching in the long vacations. Before he was twenty, he went to Washington and became the Master of a school. A year later he began the study of the law in the office of William Wirt, then Attorney General, and remained in Washington until he came to the Bar in 1830.

Chase's preparation for the Bar was defective, but he had the benefit of three years' sojourn in the Capital, where he saw and heard the great men of that day—Adams, Jackson, Webster, Clay, Wirt, Calhoun, and the great Chief Justice. His intense and life-long interest in governmental matters and in constructive statesmanship gained a primary impulse from these impressions and associations. In June, 1830, he settled down in this city and entered that disciplinary period in every lawyer's life when he is looking for business. In spite of his lack of application to the study of his profession in Washington, he had not lost his New England conscience, or his sense of responsibility for the use of his time. He read much. He organized a Lyceum and delivered four lectures himself. He helped to launch a periodical. His intellect was constantly active. He did what most young lawyers haven't the courage to do during his forced leisure. He devoted himself to hard professional work. He collated in useful form the statutes of Ohio, with annotations. It called forth the commendation of his grateful fellow members of the Bar, and of such authorities as Kent and Story. It included a history of the State. After its publication, he was able to make satisfactory professional partnerships, and for nearly twenty years he continued in the active practice of the commercial law.

Chase was a serious-minded man. He was sincerely religious. He had the moral force and persistence that prompted him to keep a journal, and this he did throughout his career. He has disclosed much of the inward workings of his heart. He revealed traits of which undue modesty was not one; but he showed his purpose to live a life of usefulness and high principle; and, more consistently than most, he pursued it.

In 1836 the interest which Mr. Chase always had had in public matters developed into a conviction and led him openly to espouse the cause of anti-slavery. He has been charged with often changing his party for personal advancement. That he was ambitious to secure opportunity for the wielding of governmental power, his dearest friend would not deny; but his stepping from one party to another did not indicate so much a change of principle on his part, as a change of principle by the shifting parties which he joined and left. He was an anti-slavery man first and a party man afterwards, and from time to time he sought the party he thought would help the cause. He said he was a Democrat. He said he was a state's rights man. His view was that the Constitution was an anti-slavery document, that it was adopted by those who deprecated slavery and intended to keep it within the slave states, and hoped that it might there die out. The cause he had at heart was to keep it where it was. His anti-slavery propaganda before the Civil War never went beyond this.

It is hard, at this distance of time, to follow the politics of Ohio from 1840 to 1860, because of the shifting and disintegrating of parties. It is difficult to understand how Chase, with his avowed anti-slavery sentiments, could be elected to the Senate by the Democrats against the Whigs in 1849, be twice elected Governor of that State after his Senate term ended, and then become Senator again in 1860; but so it was. If one would wish to vindicate his pursuit of principle in politics, one need but point to the ostracism and opprobrium that he had to undergo as an active anti-slavery man. Neither in the Senate nor in his executive office did he hesitate or falter in his consistent course. As much as any man in the country, did he contribute to the formation of the Republican party.

Mr. Chase was not a facile speaker. He had little or no sense of humor. He could not entertain crowds, but he struggled to convince his audience. He had the earnestness of conviction, the seriousness of a high purpose, great reasoning faculties, and the courage and sacrifice of careful preparation. He was a man of large physique, dignified bearing and impressive presence. He was a man of culture, one who was practiced in exact, graceful and forcible expression. He always wrote the platforms and the resolutions of the conventions and meetings organized to promote the great cause. There was nothing indolent about him. His correspondence was large, and his willingness to discuss plans for public betterment was constant.

Mr. Chase's temperament was masterful and his desire to take charge of anything in which he was interested was evident. He knew his powers, he understood the value of his experience, and he had the constructive impulse that made him anxious to apply all these in furtherance of his cause. Apparently he did not make friends of his contemporaries and his equals in point of ability and experience. He gathered about him able young men whose subsequent successes demonstrated his judgment in their selection, but he demanded of them complete devotion to the cause which he had embraced and a subordination to his own views and purposes which made some of them restive.

One cannot say that his political judgment was bad except as to his own popular strength. Though a candidate for the Presidency in 1860, in 1864, in 1868 and in 1872, his estimates of his strength generally proved to be much mistaken.

When Chase came into Lincoln's Cabinet, he shared with Seward that underestimate of Lincoln which led them both into error. Lincoln had but little knowledge of the finances of the country and he gave to Chase free scope in the Treasury. This extended to the matter of appointments, which Chase cherished and used for his friends. On the other hand, Chase did not confine his attention to his own jurisdiction. His confidence in his own judgment and what he could do if he had power in other departments, prompted him to ill-concealed criticism of the rest of the Administration. He was not disloyal, but he was not a good subordinate. He was a natural leader and his urge for leadership made him a critic of the leadership of others. Mr. Lincoln knew his defects in this regard, but knew also, and valued, his great ability and conscientious devotion to service. His plans for the improvement of the finances of the Government were more useful and effective than Congress ever gave him the opportunity to carry out. He underestimated the capacity and submission of the people, if required, to respond to heavy taxes, but even had he advocated these, it is doubtful whether Congress would have adopted them. The system of loans was much easier for politicians. Mr. Chase was the father of our National Bank System. He left in the Treasury a record of great constructive statesmanship. The burden of his office in the Civil War was second only to that of the War Office and not less important. The Atlases of that period were Lincoln, Chase and Stanton. Mr. Chase's only failures were in not securing a greater co-operation from Congress. This was because of his lack of the magnetic influence and tact to make men follow him, though he had the genius to lead and show them how.

Mr. Chase broke with Mr. Lincoln over a matter of patronage, but only after a number of similar differences, in each of which he tendered his resignation, but all of which, except the last, Mr. Lincoln smoothed over with his marvelous patience. After Chase had felt the humiliation that comes to a man who leaves an office, thinking that he is to pull down the pillars as he goes, and finds out his error, he could not restrain expression of his bitterness. But Mr. Lincoln did not cherish resentment, and when, soon after, the great office of Chief Justice became vacant, upon Taney's death, he called Chase to it. His one concern was that Chase's ambition to be President might interfere with his judicial duties. Mr. Lincoln's expectation that he would so aspire was fully justified by the event. But I think it cannot be justly said that Chase's political ambition affected his judicial action.

While on the Bench he was a candidate for the Presidency in 1868, and also in 1872; but he would not vary the principles for which he stood to capture either nomination. If it was anomalous that he should be a candidate before the Democratic Convention of 1868, with a considerable chance of success, the anomaly was only in the fact that leading Democrats had conceived it possible that the party could be reborn and support a man who was strongly and avowedly in favor of negro suffrage, and thus return to its primary principle that all men are created equal.

When Mr. Chase was called to the Bench, he had been out of the practice of the law for more than twenty years, but he had been in executive or legislative office almost constantly. He had been a student of the Constitution and its application to practical government. He had come to be intimately acquainted with departmental organization and methods, and he entered the Court better advised than any other member of that body as to government law, that law which grows and shapes itself by the practice of those who administer it. This made him most valuable in conference on such questions which were to crowd upon the Court while he was at its head.

Mr. Chase wished to be Chief Justice—had told Lincoln so early in his Cabinet experience. He had confidence that he could accomplish much public good by an interpretation of the Constitution making for a safe balance between the national and the state powers. He had a laudable ambition to become a second Marshall in the constitutional reconstruction of the government at its second birth. It is to be doubted, however, whether when he had tested the opportunities the great place afforded him, he was satisfied. He found that he had to carry a load of work which for him was the heavier because his familiarity with the principles of general law had faded some in his political life. He grew impatient with cases between individuals in which the governing principles were not constitutional and were not of public concern. Nor could he in such work separate himself from intense interest in the political questions which were occupying the statesmen of the day, and he longed to be at the helm. This did not interfere with the excellence of his judicial work, but it added to the strain on him.

Chief Justice Chase wrote many able opinions, opinions that have come down and established the law. His decision in the case of Texas v. White, where he defined with wonderful clearness the status of the seceded states, is a landmark in constitutional law in this country. Another is his concurring opinion in *ex parte Milligan,* in which he has added to the substance of the law by his definition of, and distinction between, military law, military government, and martial law. The subject has always been a difficult one, and it remained for him to clarify it so far as it has been clarified.

The course of the Legal Tender decisions gave rise to great bitterness of feeling. The Chief Justice was charged with inconsistency due to political bias, in that he supported the legal tender acts as Secretary of the Treasury, and then as Chief Justice held them to be invalid. He did not favor giving a legal tender character to the greenbacks, but he was forced into acquiescence in that feature of the law in order to secure what he regarded as indispensable to the safety of the country. It is only fair to take his own statement of the fact as the true one, namely that as Judge he conscientiously believed, after the fullest consideration, that Congress had not the power to impart to notes issued by it as currency, the character of the legal tender attaching to gold and silver coin.

The Chief Justice was a most dignified presiding officer. He had a strong sense of responsibility for the Court. His capacity to meet the requirements of a great occasion was shown when under the Constitution he had to preside at the trial of the impeachment of President Johnson. The fear that he might exercise influence to save Mr. Johnson led to efforts by the majority to restrain him as Presiding Officer; but he ignored them, asserted the full power of his position, and ruled with conspicuous impartiality, clearness and force on all the questions arising. It was a painful and difficult duty, which fortunately no other Chief Justice has ever had to discharge.

During the incumbency of Chief Justice Chase, popular feeling was strongly aroused against the Court. From time to time, by reason of its jurisdiction and its proper exercise, the Court cannot help becoming the stormy petrel of politics. It is the head of the system of Federal Courts established avowedly to avoid the local prejudice which non-residents may encounter in State Courts, a function often likely to ruffle the sensibilities of the communities, the possibility of whose prejudice is thus recognized and avoided. More than this, the Court's duty to ignore the acts of Congress or of the State Legislatures, if out of line with the fundamental law of the Nation, inevitably throws it as an obstruction across the path of the then majority who have enacted the invalid legislation. The stronger the majority, and the more intense its partisan feeling, the less likely is it to regard constitutional limitations upon its power, and the more likely is it to enact laws of questionable validity. It is convincing evidence of the sound sense of the American People in the long run and their love of civil liberty and its constitutional guaranties, that, in spite of hostility thus frequently engendered, the Court has lived with its powers unimpaired until the present day.

The assassination of Lincoln stirred the passion of the Northern people and threw power into the hands of the Radical element of the Republican part in Congress. Conflict with Lincoln's successor quickly ensued and a policy of radical reconstruction followed, which we can be reasonably sure would have been spared the South, had Mr. Lincoln lived. With a two-thirds majority in each House, the Republican party leaders brooked no opposition, and when that which had been done in due course came before the Court for consideration of its validity, the attitude of those leaders toward the Court became one of suspicion and resentment. Until one refreshes his recollection of that period, he can hardly realize how far the radical Republicans in Congress went in their effort to oust the Court of its jurisdiction. They were afraid that the Court would pronounce their reconstruction measures invalid. They were stirred to this fear by the decision in *ex parte Milligan,* in which the Court refused to recognize the power of the President in time of war to direct a Military Commission to try for treason and sentence to death a civilian in a state not invaded by the enemy and where the civil courts were functioning. For fear that the Court might hold invalid the work of such Commissions when organized under the reconstruction acts by military governors in the Southern States, Congress took the case of McArdle, presenting the question, from the Court's consideration, abruptly, after it had been argued and submitted, by repeal of its jurisdiction. In the heat of the feeling against the Court, bills were proposed limiting its power to declare laws invalid by a majority, and there were serious proposals made to abolish this power of the Court altogether. The personal attacks made upon the Court by the party were severe and unmeasured. This was the atmosphere in which Chief Justice Chase lived during his judicial service.

While mistakes were made by the Court in those days, as at other times, for it was and is a human institution, one cannot see, in looking back to that decade, that there is anything in the constitutional law as it was handed on to the next generation which is to be condemned. The result in the Legal Tender cases is still a matter of discussion by historians, students of constitutional law and political economists. The decision in the Slaughter House cases, which awakened great protest, certainly served to maintain a wise balance between the national and the state powers. The Milligan case, which called out the bitterest criticism, nevertheless laid down the principle of the maintenance of constitutional right during war, for which we are now all grateful.

The verdict of the country in retrospect as between the fever heat of the Radical Republicans in those tempestuous times against constitutional hindrance, on the one hand, and the restraining decisions of the Court, on the other, is with the Court. The people now are glad that the guaranties of personal liberty were maintained by the Court against the partisan zeal of the then majority. The Court survived the inevitable attacks upon its jurisdiction then, as it had survived them so many times before. The storm during Chief Justice Chase's term was succeeded by a judicial calm of twenty-five years till we neared another war. This result speaks on the whole for the wisdom of the conclusions of the Court over which the Chief Justice presided.

Chase was a great man. He has had the disadvantage in history of comparison with Lincoln. Next to Lincoln, he stands out as a great civil figure of the decade of the Civil War. He was actuated by moral force. He had the defects of his attributes, but among those attributes were devotion to principle, courage of conviction, indefatigable industry, and a profound patriotic desire to achieve, in the public interest.

From *The American Bar Association Journal.* By permission of the author.

THE WORLD AT NINETY-ONE

CHAUNCEY M. DEPEW

Chauncey M. Depew, lawyer, statesman, and orator, was born in Peekskill, New York, in 1834, and died April 5, 1928. Mr. Depew served as United States Senator from 1899 to 1911, and was director and president of numerous large corporations including the New York Central Railroad and the Western Union Telegraph Company. Mr. Depew was orator at the unveiling of the Statue of Liberty in New York Harbor in 1888; at the centennial celebration of the inauguration of George Washington; at the opening of the Chicago Exposition in 1893; and was the speaker on many other public occasions and at many notable dinners.

This address was delivered at the Montauk Club in Brooklyn, New York, April 23, 1924, at a banquet in Mr. Depew's honor, celebrating his ninety-first birthday. Sparkling wit and humor mingled with sound advice is characteristic of his speeches.

Ladies and Gentlemen and Fellow Members:—We live in an age of research and question. There never has been a time when investigations were so universal in every department of human interest. The laboratories were never so active, the chemists never so successful, and the inventors never filing so many patents. This urgent desire has entered great universities and museums. It has captured Congress, which gives a large part of its time and thought to investigating committees.

There has come a revival of interest in prehistoric times and the origin of the species. When Darwin first published his startling views on evolution, they were widely discussed and finally generally adopted by the scientific world. In fact, they had not been seriously questioned until William Jennings Bryan, from a religious standpoint, started an agitation for legislation to prevent the Darwinian theories from being taught in the schools and colleges.

Now there is a more extensive effort than ever to find the "missing link" or some trace of the origin of the human species. The heroes of these investigations are armed with a spade and pickaxe. They are doing wonderful work on the sites of the ancient cities and have successfully dug down to prehistoric foundations. Religious people at first distrusted these investigations for fear that their discoveries might contradict in some form the Bible, but so far they have confirmed the stories of the Sacred Book.

One of the most interesting results of this work is at a strategic point in Palestine, which was on the line of the movement of populations and of armies in ancient and even in prehistoric days. The investigators have found that as each new invasion destroyed the resident populations and burned the city, they built their own capital upon the ruins. This site has yielded historical information running back for six thousand years. It has made clear the history of Abraham and his contemporaries, and has demonstrated civilization, culture and literature of nations which survived only in tradition. Ancient Carthage is yielding treasures of art and verifying traditions of its history by the patient work of the archeologist with his spade and pickaxe.

We, here tonight, do not go back so far, but we are interested in the same line of thought. This is our thirty-fourth anniversary. It stands unique in the history of club entertainments and in the honors extended to an individual by an association of gentlemen in a social club. Of the three hundred who were present at our first dinner in honor of my birthday, I understand only eighteen survive. It is certainly a source of wonder and gratification that their successors have kept this celebration up with all its original vigor and enthusiasm.

One year beyond a third of a century has passed since we first met here to celebrate my birthday. This is my ninety-first. What a wonderful retrospect as we look over the history of the world, the development of the liberty of the people, the expansion of our humanities and the more intimate relations through closer contact, through extraordinary influences of the peoples and the nations of the world. We go through the whole period developed by the researches to which I have referred, and there is no century so remarkable and none which has produced such wonderful results as the one in which we have lived.

I have known more or less intimately fourteen of the thirty Presidents of the United States. Seven of them have occupied that great office during our thirty-four years.

At our first celebration Benjamin Harrison was president of the United States. He was very unpopular because his mannerism offended people who met him, but he is coming rapidly into his own among thoughtful people as one of the ablest and best equipped of our thirty presidents. We had Cleveland who came into office as one of the most popular and went out, nearly by unanimous consent, as one of the most unpopular of the Executives of the nation. But his fame is growing, and he is taking his place among the foremost of the Chief Magistrates of our country. Next came the lovable McKinley, one of the most companionable, and popular of our presidents, whose fame will rest on the establishment of the gold standard of value. Then came that human dynamo, Theodore Roosevelt. He prevented a European war by forcing the settlement between Russia and Japan; he built the Panama Canal, which had been the dream of statesmen for four hundred years; he settled industrial disputes by his personal influence upon the combatants, and he made himself unpopular by preventing the universal combination of industrial corporations into a few great and overwhelming trusts. We now see that, while the business world was then against him, such combinations would have led to an industrial revolution with the most disastrous consequences. Roosevelt's reputation is rapidly advancing, and the great question is, will he take his place beside the two unquestioned exemplars of all that is best in America—Washington and Lincoln? Next we had Taft, who has attained the unequalled American distinction of occupying both the presidency and the head of the other of the three branches of the government, Chief Justice of the

Supreme Court of the United States, a unique distinction never before attained, and probably never will be again. Then we had Woodrow Wilson, in regard to whose fame and place in history there is also a continuous struggle. He at one time, when he went abroad during the Great War, had a prestige which made him the most powerful man in the world, and because of the faith of all peoples, all of whom were in great distress, that in him they saw a possible saviour, he had more power in world affairs than any single man ever possessed. How he lost it is for the future to decide. Harding, Prince of good fellows, had an all-embracing interest in the welfare of his country and the world. The outstanding feature of his Administration which will live, is that he originated and carried successfully through the International Peace Conference at Washington. It is the only contribution yet made towards disarmament and prevention of future wars.

And now we have a President who came into office as Vice-President, practically unknown. In seventeen months by his reticence, his plain common sense and practical suggestions, he so captured the judgment of the American people that they chose him as their President by the largest majority ever given for that office. His policies of thrift and economy and of debt reduction for lowering the burden of taxes must become, not the policies of any party, but the popular principles of economic success. Thank God for Coolidge.

We enter upon another field and with amazing results. When we first met here William II was Emperor of Germany; Francis Joseph was Emperor of Austria and Nicholas was Czar of Russia. These three men, representing the historic families of Hohenzollern, Hapsburg and Romanoff, practically controlled the destinies of the whole world. Peace or war, with all the consequences of either, and the welfare of the whole human family were largely in the hands of these three autocrats. Their power had grown with the enlargement and expansion of their empires for over five hundred years. These three families seemed so embedded in the structure of the government of their peoples, that he would have been reckoned a mad man who would have predicted on the night we first met here, that within a third of a century their power would have been destroyed and they would have disappeared.

Andrew Carnegie, striving for peace, called upon Emperor William in 1913 to congratulate him on the celebration of the twenty-fifth anniversary of his reign. The occasion was one of splendor, and the exhibition of power, and the consolidation of the forces in army and navy, and in industrial success were such as were never before witnessed in the world. The Emperor said to Carnegie, in reply to the philanthropist's congratulations, "I have preserved peace for twenty-five years, and I propose to preserve it for twenty-five more, if God spares my life." Yet, within a year, he had plunged the world into the supreme tragedy of all times. Fifty millions of lives, untold sufferings and agonies of untold millions of people, extending from the centers of civilization to the wilds of Asia and the swamps of Africa, have been the result of the quarrels of the Hohenzollerns, Hapsburgs and Romanoffs. The Romanoff dynasty died with the family of the Czar. Emperor William is an exile and Germany is a Republic. The old Emperor Joseph died of a broken heart, and his empire has been split up into many separate nationalities.

If wisdom, instead of passion and ambition, had ruled the Conference at Versailles, Prussia would have been left alone by herself; Bavaria and Saxony would have been united to German-Austria, and the fear which now haunts and almost paralyzes Europe of another war, a war of revenge, would have disappeared for ever. There may be other wars, but they will not depend upon the insanity, or the indigestion, or the ambition of any ruling family, or any great ruler. In the cataclysmic changes which have taken place, the king business has fallen into desuetude. There is no king at present who has any autocratic power. Even the Turkish Sultan is an exile, and the Turks have now the approximation of a Republic.

The whole world is now under the domination and control, in one form or another, of a democratic spirit. The democratic spirit is not easily moved to war. The only exception to the power of the people, as we understand it in various countries, is Russia. There a few men are striving to build a government upon a class; they are leaders who have grasped every source of power and distrust even that class after they have exterminated by terrorism all others. They allow neither a free press, nor free speech, nor any of the civil and religious liberties which are recognized universally as the essence of true democracy. One of the Near East Relief representatives told me that while we saved twenty millions of lives in Russia, if we never had gone there the distress would have overthrown the Soviet Government and the peasants, already educated through generations to certain forms of government and co-operation, would have brought order out of chaos.

Well, my friends, the glory, the prestige, the glittering magnificence and power which amazed and dazed us when we began these entertainments have disappeared. The world has to be governed or else civilization ceases when chaos comes in. The world is governed, but not by people born to rule, not by people of inherited authority, not by people destined apparently by the Almighty for government, but by the business men and bankers of the world. They are the new ruling forces, and their power grows day by day. They may be materialistic in their views, they may lack idealistic and ethical theories, but at the same time they are for law and order, and for that supreme element of stability and justice, the independence and dignity of the individual, his right to earn and his right to be protected in what he earns, and an infallible belief that with home and independence come the salvation of society.

Austria had gone bankrupt and was on the verge of a collapse which would have depopulated Vienna. The business men and the bankers of the civilized countries decided that Austria must be saved. Their representative appeared at that great capital. He had with him the money which was necessary for the reorganization and rescue of the city and its territories; he had the power to prohibit and the power to enforce. Austria got the money necessary for her salvation, and a miracle was performed. Ancient Hungary was on the rocks. The business men and bankers came to the same conclusion and went to the rescue. The result is that Hungary has been saved and is entering upon a new career. The business men and bankers have saved Germany. They are helping France. The salvation of Europe depends largely on the acceptance of the Dawes Plan and that scheme is the work of the business men and the bankers.

This movement is no ordinary concentration of power in a class or in a business. It is a demonstration that the real power in this world, and in all democratic governments, is the middle class. In this country the middle class constitute nearly our entire population. Every man and every woman who is independent, self-supporting and has reached the accumulative period becomes a member of the great middle class. There is nothing now, there never has been anything which equals the tremendous power of this vast body of people in every community who have active minds, settled principles, firm consciences, warm hearts, sympathetic souls for all and independent spirits to look out and enjoy independent lives.

When heredity or the ordinary process of liberty and its development had not united this great middle class for its own protection, Providence has raised a leader equal to the task. This was pre-eminently the case in Italy where, in the darkest hour of communist triumph and chaos in industry and production, Mussolini organized and consolidated the forces of law, order and individual liberty, and has become, by his continuing success, one of the great figures of history.

Standing here at ninety-one, I naturally look back and recall the teachings which have been the source of my inspiration, health and happiness. They came from a remarkably brilliant woman, my Mother. In her simple faith, the outstanding bulwarks of hope and happiness were trust in God, a firm belief that He will relieve critical situations by special Providences, and faith that whatever misfortunes may come they are simply discipline for your good to result in great blessings, if properly studied and acted upon.

On that theory the communist revolution and the Soviet Government in Russia has so thoroughly demonstrated upon an enormous scale the failure of communism and the tragic results of its application to a whole population, that it has saved the civilization of the world. In the despair and hopelessness which came from the Great War, the people everywhere were turning desperately to all remedies which were offered. The most persistent in its propaganda was communism, and it was rapidly pervading the great industrial nations. The example of Russia killed communism in Continental Europe, in Great Britain, and even in the Far East, while it ended it almost entirely in the United States, South America and Mexico.

The American people knew little of the Constitution of the United States. Few of them had ever read it, or were familiar with its fundamental principles. The candidacy of Senator La Follette expanded into the belief that its chief issue was a complete change in the Constitution of the United States. The study of that wonderful document became universal. It went into debating societies, in the schools and colleges; it was discussed in the press and in the weekly and monthly publications; it was a live subject upon the platform at political meetings; the American people became more familiar with the Constitution and what it meant, than if it had been a part of the curriculum in the public schools. The result was an almost universal belief among the people that the safety of their political, civil and religious liberties depended upon the preservation, intact, of the Constitution of the United States.

This is not the same world at all, in an economic sense, as the one to which I was born ninety-one years ago. Far-seeing political philosophers and publicists were making gloomy prophecies as to the future. They doubted how growing populations were to be supported. Macaulay's famous letter to the author of "The Life of Thomas Jefferson" emphasized the fear. The great historian predicted that when our public lands were exhausted a huge population, which could find no employment or method of earning its bread, would break up society. Then came a wonderful succession of special Providences to take care of this increasing population of all nationalities. The application of coal to the production of steam, and the application of steam to industry, stimulated inventive minds so that great industrial centers began to be created in all civilized countries, and, as in the Scripture story, "the smoke of the factories by day, and their fires by night, led humanity to employment, to opportunity and to success and happiness."

But within our own time have been wonderful characteristics for new employment for people of our century. For instance, electrical service began forty-two years ago when, on September 21st, 1882, Edison turned on the current. The first year it served only 455 customers, and was run at a loss of $4,400. Today there are 7,000 electrical companies with nearly twelve million customers and over 200,000 employees. Thirty years ago I was one of a committee of judges to test the practicability of the automobile. Twenty-one machines entered the contest for a run of twenty-five miles from the Plaza in New York to Ardsley-on-the-Hudson. Only three arrived, the others broke down. Since then forty billions of dollars have been spent in automobiles. There are seventeen million machines in the United States today, besides those in foreign countries. This vast industry is taking care of millions of people and millions of families.

In 1876 I was offered a one-sixth interest in the Bell Telephone Company and declined, because the greatest electrical expert declared it to me to be a toy. Today it gives employment to hundreds of thousands of people, and is a necessity of every family and every business. The first spadeful of earth for a New York subway was thrown up only twenty-five years ago, and that has given an immense employment, and is carrying billions of people a year. In 1904 the moving picture industry was an experiment and financially a failure, but today there are films demanding such an immense employment, such vast resources, such special genius, that a single film may cost over a million dollars, and the industry itself is taking care of hundreds of thousands of people. The railroad, when I started, was in its infancy. Now it is the symbol and support of prosperity, industry and economic success. It then had very few people on its rolls, but today one-fifth of our population are supported by it. To all these we must add the growth of the aeroplane and the radio. The exhaustion of coal and oil is being made up by the production of electricity by water power which is abundant and eternal.

Here are the material facts which buttress our faith in the United States. They indicate our world leadership. Our national wealth is greater than that of all Europe, and it is owned, in a greater or less degree, by an overwhelming percentage of our population. Twenty-eight millions of our people have savings of over eighteen billions of dollars, and seventy-two millions have insured their lives for over fifty-five billion dollars, more than all the rest of the world. We have two-fifths of all the railway mileage, and our railroads are owned by nearly two millions of people. We have nearly two-thirds of the automobiles and the telephones of the world. Eleven millions of people and their families, who include more than fifty million persons, own their own homes, and nearly four millions of our farmers own their own farms. The United States spends more for free education for all the people than all the rest of the world put together. The demand for higher education has become universal, and the academies and high schools are turning out ambitious students in such numbers that our colleges and universities are overcrowded. This demonstrates that the substantial resources of the country are in the hands of the people, and that individual rights will be protected by constantly increasing distribution among the people of the resources of the country. I could pursue this review almost indefinitely, but I will add only one suggestion, and that is, that invention has so utilized what was waste production in the origin of most industries, that the waste has become more valuable than the original industry.

The century we are considering is pre-eminent for its benevolence, charity and religious work. Nothing has ever equalled the contributions of the Rockefeller, Carnegie and Sage Foundations. New York alone spends over eighty millions a year on missions of mercy.

Samuel B. Ruggles, a broadminded citizen and ardent churchman, sixty years ago, started a movement to build the Cathedral of St. John the Divine on what is now known as Cathedral Heights. Intense efforts at that period failed to secure sufficient contributions to make even a beginning of the work. We have recently witnessed an appeal for the same object, for which the response approaches the marvellous sum of ten millions of dollars.

Most successful men, who from small beginnings have produced prodigious results, have owed their success to their absolute confidence in the future of the United States. Disasters did not discourage them, panics did not frighten them, because they saw that in the end the United States was always a winner. The elements of hope were never so great in our country as they are today. By hope I mean stability in our government, the universal belief and support of law and order, the protection of life, and the protection of the individual in his liberties and in his property.

The greatest and most beneficial change which has occurred in our time is the improvement of the relations between capital and labor. In the early days all industry belonged to individuals, and there was a constant struggle between the owner and his employees as to the share to which they were entitled. Labor, to protect itself, rushed into unions and legislation. Then the smallest of wage earners, and the poorest paid, was labor. Today there is an extraordinary change. A skilled mechanic earns more than the average storekeeper, lawyer, doctor or minister. He has a surplus which he invests in a home which he owns, in the industry in which he is employed, and in labor banks. The industries have become so vast, and their stockholding interests so enormous, that all of them are run necessarily by managers.

These managers are employees, and so are the whole operating forces of our great industries. The result is, there is an intelligent and almost brotherly co-operation by which capital and labor equally share in the results. Labor is fully protected and is largely satisfied. While the control of these great corporations is entirely in the hands of managers, because the owners have become so numerous and widely scattered, nevertheless the managers are under the control of boards of trustees or directors. It is a wonderful tribute to the business character, uprightness, intelligence and honesty which finds its way into these boards of directors, that individually and collectively they take their duties most seriously, act upon their best business judgment for the interest intrusted to their care, and have a most sensitive and highly cultured business conscience.

Two friends of mine, one a very extraordinarily successful man of affairs and captain of industry, and the other a speculator who plunged and won or lost, more by instinct than ability, were discussing whether success in life was due to judgment or luck. The financier said judgment, and the speculator absolutely luck. Said the speculator, "You are a forty-niner; that was an adventure." "Not on my part," said the financier, "but judgment." "You did not go to the gold diggings with the rest, but became their banker." "Judgment again." "You came to New York at a period when the investment of your money yielded larger returns than at any other period." "Pure judgment." "You doubled your fortune by risking much of it in an enterprise that was dependent on prosperity continuing for a succession of years." "Pure judgment," again said the financier. "Well," said the speculator, "won't you admit then that you are almighty lucky that you have such good judgment?"

So, my friends, I have come to the conclusion, after a long experience and many large observations with mature judgment, properly based, and properly buttressed, that the only sure guides to success are character, health and happiness. Each man of my age receives personally and by letter innumerable inquiries of how to be happy, how to be healthy and how to live long.

Happiness has a curious quality in that it increases by its distribution. Longevity is largely a matter of curbing appetites, until temperance and moderation become habits, and from this review which I have made of the world at large, of our own country and our own community, I am more firmly convinced than ever that this is a mighty good world to live in, inhabited by mighty companionable and lovable people, and I want to stay here as long as I can.

By permission of the author.

LIBERTY AND LAW

CHARLES E. HUGHES

Charles Evans Hughes, lawyer and statesman, a power in his profession, has held public office with great honor. Early in his career he was counsel to State and Federal governments in important investigations. He was twice elected Governor of the State of New York (1907–'11), but resigned during his second term to accept appointment (1910) as an associate justice of the Supreme Court of the United States. In 1916 he was Republican candidate for President. President Harding appointed him Secretary of State and President Coolidge retained him, but in 1925 he resigned from the Cabinet to resume his law practice in New York City. Mr. Hughes was born in Glens Falls, New York, in 1862. He received degrees from Colgate, Brown, and Columbia universities before he was admitted to the bar, and many universities have since been proud to have him accept their honorary LL.D. He was President of the American Bar Association (1924–'25), and was appointed (1930) Chief Justice of the Supreme Court of the United States by President Hoover.

This address was delivered before the American Bar Association, Detroit, Michigan, September, 1925. Mr. Hughes has an exceptionally fine delivery and an address that is calmly forceful and often delightfully friendly.

In availing myself this morning of the privilege of speaking not for the Association, but to the Association, I am impelled to make a few observations on liberty and law—a combination which our political alchemists seem to find increasing difficulty in successfully achieving. If I trench upon subjects of a controversial sort, I trust that you will not think that I am endeavoring to provoke contention, but rather—if I may change the figure—to climb with you to the pleasant heights which rise above the controversial plane, where one may gain a wider view and see larger objectives than those which loom in the imagination of the doughty warriors whose passionate zeal misses the higher strategy and may cause the sacrifice of some of the strongholds which the struggle for liberty has won. We call ourselves the ministers of justice, but we are reminded that the justice to be administered is justice according to law—the expression of the democratic will—and our still nobler privilege is that of the prophets and guides of society, versed in the long history of human progress, who may not forget so easily the standards which must be maintained if justice is not to be an illusion and democracy a mockery of our highest hopes. In our proper desire to promote a better understanding of our Constitution and of the advantages of its guarantees, let us not fail to remember that if it was designed to form a more perfect union, establish justice, insure domestic tranquillity, provide for the common defense and promote the general welfare, these purposes found their ultimate aim in the determination to secure to ourselves and our posterity the blessings of *liberty.* It was to attain these ends, the security of life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness, that this Government was instituted among men. This purpose is not achieved by praising the Constitution, worthy of praise as it is. First, because the Constitution leaves a broad field for legislative discretion. In the technique of constitutional law, the legislature must always be regarded as possessed of adequate learning, of wisdom, of pure motives. There must be very clear grounds for interfering with the action of representative bodies of such imputed virtue. But in actual experience, on the political highways which the Constitution has laid out, there is abundant opportunity for reckless driving. Then, the Constitution itself may be amended. There have been strong arguments in support of a doctrine of implied restrictions on the power of amendment, but apart from the explicit limitation found in Article V, it would be difficult to set bounds to what a militant opinion may demand and put through. It is even possible to obtain the consent of three-fourths of the states without the support of a majority of the people of all the states. The idea that the police power of the states could not be invaded by amendment can no longer be cherished. At the outset, in the Constitutional Convention, it was proposed by Mr. Sherman that the proviso in the article for amendments should be extended so as to provide "that no state should be affected in its internal police," but Mr. Madison objected to this, saying that "if the convention began on these special provisos every state would insist on them," and the proposal was defeated. The states have long been accustomed to the curb of the due process and equal protection clauses of the Fourteenth Amendment. The states are not to be destroyed; they may not be deprived of their equal suffrage in the Senate; but they may be shorn, as they have been shorn, of power. Aside from the ten original amendments, or bill of rights, which virtually accompanied the adoption of the Constitution, we have had nine amendments. For one hundred and twenty-one years we had only five amendments, and of these two were adopted over one hundred years ago and three followed the Civil War. Recently we have entered upon a new era, in which amendments and proposals for amendment are the order of the day. In the last twelve years we have had four amendments of far-reaching effect, providing for a federal income tax, for popular election of Senators, for prohibition of the manufacture and sale of intoxicating liquors, and for woman suffrage. It is not my purpose to criticize any of these amendments, much less the broad power of amendment. That power is our essential means of adaptation, our answer to the inciters of violence, our assurance of meeting peacefully—without any good reason for resort to revolution—all demands to which new exigencies may give rise. But that power and the proved facility of its exercise warn us not to put our trust in papers or in legalism. We shall maintain our constitutional guarantees only so long as they embody the American spirit. The fundamental need is not satisfied by the fundamental law, but only by a tenacious grasp of the fundamental principles which are back of that law—the principles of liberty to be respected, illustrated and applied by law. We are admonished, as we consider the times, that we must take fresh hold of these principles, treasure our privilege to declare them, extricate them from the confusion of controversies, make them plain to the well-meaning and zealous citizens who in the pursuit of aims believed to be worthy may be unmindful of them.

When we think of the menaces to a well-ordered freedom we are apt first to lament the multiplicity and uncertainty of laws. And well we may. From my earliest recollection our leaders have bewailed the growing volume of our laws, and never have lamentations been more sincere or more futile. We stand up in these meetings like prophets of old, as if clad in haircloth and fed on locusts and wild honey, crying, "Prepare ye the way of the law! Make its paths straight and smooth!" And then, casting aside the prophetical garb, and supported by a more generous diet, our lawyers in and out of the legislatures of forty-eight states and federal Congress resume the never ending task of heaping up laws and providing thickets instead of roads. The cause of this is not to be found in lack of sincerity. The truth is that these multiplying laws are largely the natural sequence of other laws; they are proposed to meet the demands of individuals and communities seeking changes and improvements that they may escape the meshes in which they already find themselves entangled. After you get through with private bills, local bills, amendments of charters of all sorts, relief of towns, villages and cities, provisions for public improvements, and appropriations, you will probably find that the bulk of legislation of a general nature directly touching our lives and property is much smaller than you thought, although much larger than it ought to be. And if you look at the mass of discarded legislative proposals, at the thousands of bills that annually fail, your eyes may brighten. But you cannot fail to realize that however we may decry, as we should continue to decry, the increasing volume of statutes, the greatest menace is not in numbers but in character. One little statute, in a few words, may carry a thrust at a vital spot, or inflict a serious wound and give us far more trouble than a thousand prolix measures which may do no one any serious injury and of which most persons are happily ignorant.

The most ominous sign of our time, as it seems to me, is the indication of the growth of an intolerant spirit. It is the more dangerous when armed, as it usually is, with sincere conviction. It is a spirit whose wrath must be turned away by the soft answers of a sweet reasonableness. It can be exorcised only by invoking the Genius which watched over our infancy and has guided our development—a good Genius—still potent let us believe—the American spirit of civil and religious liberty. Our institutions were not devised to bring about uniformity of opinion; if they had been, we might well abandon hope. It is important to remember, as has well been said, that "the essential characteristic of true liberty is, that under its shelter many different types of life and character and opinion and belief can develop unmolested and unobstructed." Nowhere could this shelter be more necessary than in our own country with its different racial stocks, variety of faiths, and the manifold interests and opinions which attest the vigor and zest of our intellectual life. Let not the vital principle be obscured by mere discussions of constitutional power. We justly prize our safeguards against abuses but they will not last long if intolerance gets under way. Some may still entertain the notion that democracy means liberty; that having disposed of dynasties and successfully stormed the citadels of autocracy and privilege, having won the suffrage and denounced political disqualifications, liberty is secured. Undoubtedly the possession of equal political rights is demanded by a people instinct with the love of liberty, and only by such a people can they be maintained, as there is always the danger that the power gained by the exercise of these rights will be used to limit or destroy their exercise by others. Especially should we be on our guard against varieties of a false Americanism which professes to maintain American institutions while dethroning American ideals. But the just demands of liberty are not to be satisfied even by a free and uncorrupted right of suffrage. Democracy has its own capacity for tyranny. Some of the most menacing encroachments upon liberty invoke the democratic principle and assert the right of the majority to rule. Shall not the people—that is, the majority—have their heart's desire? There is no gainsaying this in the long run, and our only real protection is that it will not be their heart's desire to sweep away our cherished traditions of personal liberty. The interests of liberty are peculiarly those of individuals, and hence of minorities, and freedom is in danger of being slain at her own altars if the passion for uniformity and control of opinion gathers head.

There is the greater danger as the complexities of society increasingly demand that the range of personal volition be limited by law in the interest of liberty itself. We are compelled to lay stress on restraints in the view that the liberty which permits freedom of action would be a barren privilege if it did not also connote freedom from injurious action by others, and the security of life and of individual opportunity lies in its immunities. Civilization itself is progress in multiplying restraints to conserve opportunities. The discoveries of science constantly reveal new menaces with which only organized society can cope. When we have made sure our escape from despots we find new enemies lurking to frustrate our pursuit of happiness. We are subject to the onslaughts of myriads of foes which we call germs, quite as destructive of life, health and happiness as any autocracy. Liberty is today a broader conception than ever before, for it increasingly demands protection; it demands protection against infection, against the spread of disease; it requires preventive measures and the segregation of those afflicted. It demands protection on the public highways against those frequent abusers of liberty who have subjected the peripatetic philosophers of our day and other simple-minded pedestrians to perils which in frequency and deadliness are of a sort formerly only known to soldiers on the battlefield. It is in need of safeguards against organized endeavors to exploit individuals whether those who labor in insanitary sweat-shops or the consumers of necessaries constrained to purchase them at excessive prices. Liberty today has such broad scope that it taxes the acumen of the ablest statesman to provide laws which even measurably assure it. It is no longer the simple matter of doing what one pleases in the wide open spaces, for there are no such spaces and the danger from other libertines more than offsets the delight in an uncontrolled freedom. In providing through popular government these guarantees of the new liberty we have become so accustomed to the increasing need for regulations, because of congestion of population in great communities, because of the necessity of resisting the assaults and contrivances of the predatory who have their own notions of freedom, that we are disposed to become obsessed with the assertion of community power and with the creation of all sorts of legislative restraints which, in the language of the day, we can "put across" constitutionally. We are apt to be unmindful of the other aspects of liberty and of the supreme aim and justification of the law-making of free men and women, which should ever be found, not in the satisfactions of the lust of power, not in an imperious domination and command of uniformity, but in the purpose to secure the freedom of the individual—an ordered freedom, but still freedom—subject only to such restraints as a sound and tolerant judgment determines to be essential to the mutuality of liberty.

It is with this practical aim, and not in the mere desire to uphold an abstract theory, that we invoke the spirit of our institutions to secure the maintenance of local autonomy for local concerns. The intricacies of our interrelations which demand action in the national sphere, as national concerns multiply, make attention to the requirements of local self-government all the more important, so that the individual may have as direct a part as possible in the government of his life, a part which shall not be rendered relatively inconsequential by the centralization of power. There is, indeed, a distinct national interest in maintaining local self-government, for proper national concerns will be better directed and the accountability of national officers and legislators will be more intelligently enforced by a people whose sense of responsibility is sharpened by their participation in the control of their local affairs. Every restriction of the authority of local self-government must show cause in the interest of the liberties and opportunities of all and not in the mere desire of one or more communities or groups to govern the life of others, albeit for their own good. There may be an imperialism at home as well as abroad. Apart from the historic reason for our dual system of government, we rally to its defense because of an increasing appreciation of the priceless opportunity it affords to conserve the interests of an ordered freedom.

Again, where schemes of control are needed either in national or local affairs, we find it necessary ever to be on the alert against insidious encroachments under the guise of official discretion—against the armored cars of bureaucrats which run so freely without showing a head to hit. We have had to overcome our reluctance to invest administrative officials with adequate power to control abuses. We have escaped our denunciation of the multiplication of laws by passing laws under the guise of regulations. If science and the artifices of the unscrupulous have disclosed new perils they have also shown the impotence of mere general legislation. Legislators have little time to follow the trails of expert inquiry and so we turn the whole business over to a few with broad authority to make the actual rules which control our conduct. The exigency is inescapable but the guardians of liberty will ever be watchful lest they are rushed from legislative incapacity into official caprice. If we escape bureaucracy it will not be because of dissertations on delegations of legislative authority. We are a practical people and necessary delegations will not fail to find reasons to support them. It will be only because we never lose sight of the ultimate purpose of government, because we would rather take some risks than give too much leeway to officialism, because we refuse to establish or maintain power for its own sake, and because we have the assertiveness of the unbroken will of free men who will insist that every public officer must constantly feel that he is a servant and not a master, the servant of an intelligent community which is content with thorough investigation and impartial findings and scientific applications, but is not servile and is able and quick to detect favoritism or arbitrariness. It will be for the reason that we are not willing to exchange our birthright for a mess of administrative pottage, no better for being prepared by democratic cooks.

After all allowances are made for multiplying laws and complex administration, after all the proper demands of an intricate social life have been fairly met, there still remain the old categories—or let us call them citadels—of individual liberty which are not to be surrendered. What are these? The Supreme Court of the United States has recently described them in these words: Liberty "denotes not merely freedom from bodily restraints, but also the right of the individual to contract, to engage in any of the common occupations of life, to acquire useful knowledge, to marry, to establish a home and bring up children, to worship God according to the dictates of his own conscience, and generally to enjoy those privileges long recognized at common law as essential to the orderly pursuit of happiness by free men." Our constitutional guarantees of these essentials and the judicial mechanism we have devised to maintain them, are better understood and more fully supported by our people, I believe, than they have been for a long period. But, as I have said, the alert citizen will not be content even with these. Within the sphere of permissible legislative activity, where motives and purposes may be more freely debated than in judicial proceedings, he will be swift to detect the impairment of his privileges and the perversion of law to ulterior aims inconsistent with the standards of liberty. And some of these standards need a new emphasis at this time.

If progress has taught us anything, it is the vital need of the freedom of learning. If we have any assurance for the future, it lies in education, in the dissemination of correct information, in availing ourselves of the investigations of science, in the formation of a sound public opinion which must rest on a broad liberal culture. When we consider the abuses which vex our life, the problems caused by the inevitable conflict of interests, the incitements of cupidity, the baffling obstacles to reasonable processes which are traceable to ignorance, and the opportunities of demagogy taking advantage of all these—the vast difficulties in making democratic institutions work—we always come back to education and buttress our hope in its manifold instrumentalities and our response to their call. But reliance upon education will be in vain if we do not maintain the freedom of learning. Perhaps that is the most precious privilege of liberty—the privilege of knowing, of pursuing untrammelled the paths of discovery, of inquiry, of invention. And like other privileges of liberty, it is not one to be reserved to a few. It belongs to all, and the only protection for all is that it does belong to all and that society is thus assured its full benefit.

Yet it is with respect to the freedom of learning that we find a disposition to impose restrictions which cannot fail to give us grave concern. It is to be observed in the field of medical research. What department of intellectual activity is more important to a free people? Of what avail are the privileges of life, if we do not live? Of what gain is liberty, if we succumb to the ravages of communicable diseases? Of what value is government, if it puts research under ban and permits the spread of plagues which knowledge may prevent? In what area of endeavor has there been such fruitage as in preventive medicine, saving countless lives and putting an end to indescribable agonies of human beings? Yet we observe persistent attempts in our legislatures not only to impair the immunities already gained, but to hamper scientific investigations through which alone the scourges of disease now beyond remedy may come under control.

While with a different purpose, we observe the manifestations of the same spirit in the efforts to interfere with instruction in our schools, not to promote the acquisition of knowledge, but to obstruct it. The Supreme Court of the United States has had occasion to deal with such an attempt to control teaching in private schools. Under a statute, forbidding the teaching of any other than the English language to a pupil who had not passed the eighth grade, a teacher was subjected to a criminal prosecution for teaching the German language. Even the court, with its necessarily limited judicial vision, could see what lay behind such an enactment and condemned it as an unwarranted interference with the constitutional guarantee of liberty. "Evidently," said the court, "the legislature has attempted materially to interfere with the calling of modern language teachers, with the opportunities of pupils to acquire knowledge, and with the power of parents to control the education of their own children." The statute as applied was found to be arbitrary and without reasonable relation to any end within the competency of the state. The same principle was applied in the Oregon school case where the statute under review in substance attempted to interfere with the privilege in instruction in private schools. "The child," said the Supreme Court, "is not the mere creature of the state. Those who nurture him and direct his destiny have the right coupled with the high duty to recognize and prepare him for additional obligations." Manifestly the purpose of the statute was not to aid education, but arbitrarily to interfere with the freedom of instruction.

The question is now presented as to the control of education in the public schools. I do not propose to discuss evolution, or a particular statute and litigation recently much advertised; or even constitutional issues which, grave as they are, are of less concern than a sound public sentiment on the larger question involved. I desire in a non-controversial spirit to emphasize the vast importance of the freedom of learning in the hope that our people instinct with the spirit of liberty will not lay hands on our public schools and state universities to set obstacles in the path of knowledge. It is a plausible statement that if the state provides institutions of learning, it is entitled to determine what shall be taught in them. Let the taxpayers, it is said—the majority, it is meant—define the curriculum. Of course, there is power to regulate the curricula in public educational institutions and this power is exercised by Boards of Education and various educational authorities under legislation in all our states. And, while I shall not attempt, as I have said, to discuss the constitutional questions raised by particular legislation which will come under the appropriate judicial review, the constitutional criterion is sufficiently apparent and that is whether legislation with regard to courses of instruction, as to what may and may not be taught, has relation to a legitimate object within the state power and is not to be condemned as arbitrary and capricious. Laying on one side the constitutional question of power, always considered with every appropriate presumption in favor of its exercise, we have the even more fundamental question of the proper standards of state action in the field of education and how its authority should be used in a free society even if there were no constitutional restrictions. Should it not be used with the intelligent and sole purpose to promote the acquisition of knowledge, to make broad the avenues of research, to disseminate the information which the toil of countless laborers in the difficult fields of learning has acquired? If it be understood that the end to be attained is the diffusion of knowledge, and not its prevention, the means will be considered with a view to that end. As we reflect upon the course of history, we cannot fail to appreciate how little we owe to governments and how much to education and to the methods and achievements of scientific inquiry. Governments and statesmen have too often stood in the way; they have helped to the extent that they have kept the avenues open. If we sum up the comforts, the conveniences, the privileges and the opportunities of our life in the twentieth century, if we look back upon the privations, the menaces, the exposures from which the progress of civilization has gradually relieved not only the most fortunate, but the vast masses of the people in enlightened countries, we must realize that these benefits are due, not so much to governments, or politics, or the strivings and issues of campaigns, but to the ceaseless and unobtrusive endeavors, and the unquenchable zeal, of the pioneers and their devoted followers in the quest of knowledge, who in the study of the earth and the universe have enlarged the inheritance of the race and vindicated the capacity and worth of the human spirit. Believing, as I do, that the freedom of learning is the vital breath of democracy and progress, I trust that a recognition of its supreme importance will direct the hand of power, and that our public schools—for the mass of our young people can know no other—and our state universities, the crown of our educational system, may enjoy the priceless advantages of courses of instruction designed to promote the acquisition of all knowledge and may not be placed under restrictions to prevent it, and that our teachers and professors may be encouraged, not to regard themselves as the pliant tools of power, but to dedicate their lives to the highest of all purposes, to know and to teach the truth, the whole truth and nothing but the truth. This is the path of salvation of men and democracy.

It would be serious enough if interference with education found its motive in the desire to control intellectual activity in the interest of former intellectual concepts, but it is far more serious when these endeavors are for the purpose of controlling the pursuit of knowledge in what is supposed to be the interest of religion by aiming at the protection of creed or dogma. To control curricula in our public schools and state universities in the interest of a reasonable arrangement of courses of study in order to aid the acquisition of knowledge, is one thing; to attempt to control public instruction in the interest of any religious creed or dogma is quite another. If we are true to the ideal of religious liberty the power of government is not to be used to propagate religious doctrines or to interfere with the liberty of the citizen in order to maintain religious doctrines. The question is not whether these doctrines are true and should be embraced. The point is that this is not the way to foster their support. In our country there are all sorts of religious beliefs and practices, and at one time or another before religious liberty was established here our forbears in other lands have all alike—Baptists, Presbyterians, Catholics, Jews, Quakers and others—suffered persecution at the hand of government. What was the reason of this persecution? Was it not a plausible one? What could be more plausible than that the truth of religion should be fostered and supported by the state? But if so fostered and supported, its nature will be determined by the state. What could be a nobler exercise of governmental power than to destroy religious error and save the souls of men from perdition? That plausible pretext has given us the saddest pages of history. That is the road that leads back to the perversion of authority and the abhorrent practices of the dark days of political disqualifications on grounds of religion, of persecution, of religious wars, of tortures, of martyrdom. If kings and princes, or the legislative majorities which have succeeded them, may enter the domain of conscience it is certain that they will make this entry with the most fiery zeal, the most profound conviction, the most ruthless determination of which the human heart is capable. We have problems enough without introducing religious strife into our politics. If we are to be saved a recrudescence of interference with religious liberty, mistaken zeal must be checked as soon as it appears, not by opposing religion or faith, but by maintaining freedom for religion and faith, not on the false assumption that we are not a deeply religious people, but rather by appealing to the sincere patriotic hearts of those to whom religion and faith are dear that they may not be led to demand the sacrifice of the vital principles of free institutions. I said a moment ago that the effort to control the acquisition of knowledge was supposed to be in the interest of religion; in truth, it cannot be in that interest. There is in our human nature an ineradicable curiosity with respect to the earth in which we live, to other worlds, to the universe of which we are such an infinitesimal part. It is a God-given instinct to search for truth, and nothing short of the truth will ever satisfy our yearning. There are no conflicts in truth. To learn, to know, is the way of life, and faith only serves to honor the quest. The history of religion shows the futility of governmental efforts to control it. We are here today—all of us, of whatever faith—as witnesses of that futility. The highest interests of the soul demand freedom, not fetters, and the immunity of the domain of conscience from the control of government is the assurance of the richest fruitage of the spiritual life.

When we turn to the consideration of the administration of justice in our courts, we shall do well to consider our problems from a similar standpoint. In a democratic society, the enforcement of law finds its justification not in the interest of authority, as such, but in the maintenance of respect for law as proceeding from a free people and as being essential to liberty which vanishes if violence, turbulence and disorder usurp the place of law. Respect for law in such a society is a sportsmanlike regard for the rules of the game which cannot be had without rules. Be careful in the making of the rules and play the game. If we endeavor to define the fundamental needs in the administration of justice, they might perhaps be called simplicity and expertness. We have tied ourselves up in procedural requirements and it is pleasant to observe that gradually we are gaining freedom from an unnecessary network. We have marshalled the forces of simplification and, as it is said that the truth will come out even in affidavits, we may ultimately expect common sense to have a better chance even in the practice of the law. In our federal system, notable improvement has been made by the passage of the bill regulating procedure on appellate review by the Supreme Court—a bill sponsored by the Chief Justice and Associate Justices of the court and by this Association. We are still waiting for the passage of a simple bill giving to the Supreme Court the power to establish rules to govern the practice on the common law side of the federal courts of original jurisdiction. The difficulty in obtaining this measure of relief, which this Association has long advocated, well illustrates the conservatism that fails to conserve, that is careful of the form at the expense of the substance.

The first aid to the development of expertness in the administration of justice is in maintaining proper standards of legal education and for admission to the Bar. There is no guaranty of liberty in any true sense in putting the community in bondage to the ignorant. The unlearned practitioner of medicine may deprive the unhappy subject of his life without any due process whatever. The chief losses of society are due to incompetence, and the charges of an ill-informed lawyer, whatever they may be, are too high. It should be understood that there is no "unalienable right" of the untrained to practice law and there is no special need of multiplying lawyers at the expense of training. The first duty of Bar associations in our states, cities and counties is to see that the unfit as to either knowledge or character are not admitted to practice. High standards of admission to the Bar will mean less ill-advised litigation and fewer hardships for trustful clients.

We constantly need to emphasize to the community, too often unmindful of its interests, the importance of obtaining for the Bench the best possible representation of an expert Bar. A poor judge is perhaps the most wasteful indulgence of the community. You can refuse to patronize a merchant who does not carry a good stock, but you have no recourse if you are haled before a judge whose mental or moral goods are inferior. Good intention is no substitute for adequate knowledge. The proper choice of judges is the special concern of the Bar, not because of any desire that the community should be restricted in its power of choice, but that it should choose well with the knowledge of the professional rating of candidates. A lawyer may be successful in deceiving his clients or the community as to his attainments, but he is known to his professional brethren and their assay is a needed warning of the lack of valuable content in much that may fascinate with its glitter the public gaze. We may take just pride in the fact that under our systems of selection we have obtained such a high grade of ability in our courts and that they well-nigh universally command respect. But here and there, and too often, we meet the drive of political organizations, and there are not lacking cases of misdirected ambition making a popular appeal, to put incompetent men on the Bench, and it is our privilege as lawyers to oppose these, not in the spirit of caste, but by promoting an intelligent appreciation of the essential safeguards of our liberties. An honest, high-minded, able, and fearless judge is the most valuable servant of democracy, for he illumines justice as he interprets and applies the law, as he makes clear the benefits and the shortcomings of the standards of individual and community right among a free people.

But if we are to have and keep good judges we must properly provide for them. This Association has been seeking to get a better scale of compensation for our federal judges and we regret that despite the exigency, which should at once be recognized, this relief has been delayed. The independence and dignity of judicial office, the love of the study of the law, makes such an appeal to good lawyers who are not mere men of commerce, that there will be no difficulty in adequately recruiting the Bench if we give talent a fair show. But too great a sacrifice should not be asked, and in our large cities where the cost of living is especially high it is a reproach to our democracy that it is almost necessary that federal judges should be selected from those who have independent means. No able young lawyer should find it impossible to contemplate a judicial career because he will be unable to bring up a family in the circumstances suitable to the station of the representative of justice in a notably prosperous community. Let the needed economy in public expenditures be gained by holding up the wasteful outlays of unnecessary and extravagant public enterprises rather than in withholding the modest sums which are needed to equip an expert and essential public service. We may improve procedure, but any rules of procedure will be disappointing if we have poor umpires.

We too often think of liberty in connection with the administration of justice simply as it relates to the protection of the rights of one accused of crime—that is, to know the charge against him, to be represented by counsel, to be confronted with witnesses, to have an impartial trial. But liberty is not simply for the accused. We have a shocking prevalence of crime, and of crimes of violence, infractions of the plainest requirements of civilized society about which there is no debate. Our capacity to protect life itself is in question. There is a manifest failure to secure, through an adequate administration of our criminal laws and appropriate punishment of crimes, the deterrent effects which are in large part the object of these laws. This failure is due in part, but only to a slight extent, to obscurities in statutes; in part it may be attributed to defects in a procedure which favors delays and obstructions to the course of justice. The chief cause is probably a laxity of public sentiment—a general flabbiness with multiform disclosures—the most difficult thing to correct. There is no single remedy that will suffice and a co-operation of remedial efforts is needed. But we can do much at the Bar and on the Bench to secure the promptness, dignity and efficiency which should characterize administration. Lawyers are largely responsible, I fear, for the lowering of the standards of justice, by seeking, if not demanding, an inordinate latitude especially in sensational cases. It is natural that cases which engage the public imagination should evoke the interest that attaches to a spectacular contest—a battle of wits—in which the fascination of the display of forensic skill displaces the just regard for the interests of the community, of the great hosts who are not on trial but whose right to security in their lives and property is deeply involved. It is impossible to escape the spectacular and no one would desire that the appropriate safeguards of innocence should be impaired. But it is vital that the purpose, the firmness and the dignity of judicial procedure should stand out above the strife of contestants. Judges are so desirous of being fair that they are loathe to curtail forensic opportunities. They also have a keen eye for the possibility that they may be betrayed into error and that a long and expensive trial may in consequence go for nothing. But the Bar and the community will support a judge who knowing the range of his discretion and his responsibility will show his mastery of the proceedings before him. There is no reason why lawyers should be permitted to talk for hours on motions and objections, to make irrelevant speeches and to consume an inordinate time in blithesome excursions under the guise of cross-examination, especially of expert witnesses. We have become so accustomed to a broad exercise of discretion that lawyers not infrequently take more time in dealing with motions and objections than they would be allowed in arguing an important constitutional question before the Supreme Court of the United States. Of course, there are difficult states of fact in courts of first instance, conflicts of witnesses, which need suitable allowance for explication, but the excursions and declamations to which I refer, so frequently witnessed in criminal trials, have little to do with the issues. It is this sort of thing which brings about a confusion of the public mind. An expert Bar, tenacious of its rights and also aware of their limitations can aid the courts by keeping within the lines and by not attempting to play off-side. Let us not talk simply of rules of procedure in the desire to obtain the appropriate punishment of crime and the enforcement of law, but make it our concern that trials of criminal cases shall be less a game to please the spectators than a serious and successful effort to deal promptly and efficiently with a precise charge with no right infringed and no nonsense tolerated.

Liberty and law—one and inseparable! The noblest endeavor of democracy to safeguard the one by intelligence in the other! That balanced judgment it is our highest privilege to aid in maintaining. We do not worship at the shrine of formalism; we do not follow the false gods which are satisfied by oblations and ceremonies. It is not the tithe of mint, anise, and cummin of the law upon which our attention is centered. We are free citizens of a republic with an unprecedented opportunity for an orderly progress and for an ever wider diffusion of prosperity, which are impossible save as justice is adequately served. Let us rise to our opportunity and as guardians of the traditions which constitute the precious possession of our democracy play our part in establishing and making secure the authority of law as the servant of liberty wisely conceived, as the expression of the righteousness which exalteth a nation.

By permission of the author.

WOODROW WILSON

MEMORIAL ADDRESS

EDWIN ANDERSON ALDERMAN

Edwin Anderson Alderman, president of the University of Virginia since 1904, was born at Wilmington, North Carolina, in 1861. He came to his present office via professorships in history and education at the University of North Carolina and Tulane University, and by reason of his distinguished literary ability and his forceful personality. His writings include history, biography, and social philosophy. He is editor-in-chief of the Library of Southern Literature.

This address was delivered in the House of Representatives, in 1924, before the President and his Cabinet, the justices of the Supreme Court, the members of both Houses of Congress, and the representatives of foreign governments, who had gathered to pay tribute to the memory of the War President. The address is notable—a splendid example of preparation, content, and delivery.

In his oration in memory of the first Athenians who fell in the Peloponnesian War, Pericles commended the fitness of the Athenian public funeral, but doubted the wisdom of any speech, declaring that where men's deeds have been great they should be honoured in deed only, and that the reputation of many should never depend upon the judgment or want of it of one, and their virtue exalted or not, as he spoke, well or ill. I can, in some faint measure, comprehend what was passing in the mind of the great Athenian as I stand here today, in this chamber which has often resounded with his own lucid eloquence, to seek to make clear in brief speech the character and achievements of Woodrow Wilson, the twenty-eighth President of the United States.

In the case of a statesman, all experience warns us not to attempt to fix his final place in history until the generation that knew him and loved him, or hated him, shall have passed away and a new generation, to whom he was not a familiar figure, shall have come upon the stage, capable of beholding him with eyes undimmed by emotion and judging him with minds unclouded by prejudice or by passion. Loyalty and duty and reverence none the less urge us to set down, while memory is clear and events are fresh, what we know of men upon whom their fellow men placed great burdens of power, to whom whole races and nations turned in moments of peril and disaster, and upon whose decisions, from time to time, rested the courses of history. Woodrow Wilson was such a man; and, in such a spirit, I undertake to discover the sources of his power and to perceive the bases of his far-shining fame, more widespread about the earth in his lifetime than the fame of any of his predecessors in office, and more interwoven into the fabric of civilization than any of those who have gone before him, save Washington, the founder of the Republic, Jefferson, the fountain of its idealism, and Lincoln, the exemplar of its magnanimity and the preserver of its internal unity.

The presidential office constitutes one of the glories of the framers of our government and the presidential succession a miracle of good fortune in the hazard of democratic politics and a constant tribute to the sober instincts of popular judgment. The makers of the Constitution apparently forgot their fear of tyranny when they created the Presidency and seemed to proceed on the principle that if you place immense authority in a man's hands you kill his greed for usurpation and awake in him a magic capacity and a solemn purpose to transform his weaknesses into strength and his unworthiness into worthiness.

Some American Presidents have been commonplace men, but none of them has ever betrayed his trust or stained his honour; and from George Washington to the present hour the line of American Presidents has surpassed in character, ability, and devotion any line of kings and prime ministers known to me in modern history. They have not always been scholars. Indeed, few of them have been scholars, but when chosen—and the method of their choice sometimes bewilders the reflective and grieves the judicious—they have dug out of their latent forces and brought to bear upon their awful tasks such common sense, strong wills, noble industry, uprightness of purpose, that the great office still wears a more than imperial quality to enrich the imagination and to enlist the faith of mankind.

It would have been wiser to intrust this task of interpretation to one closer to Woodrow Wilson when he was the head of the state and his will shaped the destinies of men. Such was not my privilege. My qualifications are of a simpler and a more unpretentious nature. I studied the shorter catechism, a drastic, bracing moral tonic, with him in the Presbyterian Church of which his father, Joseph R. Wilson, was pastor, in the old city of Wilmington, N. C., my birthplace, where from time to time Thomas Woodrow Wilson would appear at home from college, to my younger eyes a tall, slender youth of curious homeliness, detachment, and distinction.

As a child, sitting in the pew of my father, who was an officer in that church, and looking into the finely moulded face of Joseph R. Wilson and listening to the words he spoke, I had my first perception that beauty and music and power to move even young hearts lay in the English tongue when fitly joined to substantial thought and serious eloquence; and he has remained to me, as he did to his famous son, through the discipline of a generation of sermons, a standard of good preaching to which it is a delight and a comfort now and again to repair. The world owes a great debt to Joseph R. Wilson; for, though the son studied under many masters, none influenced him so strongly as his father, who bred in him an impatience of dullness and diffuse thinking, a precise sense of word values, a scorn of priggishness and formal piety, the power to proceed straight to the core of a subject under discussion, and to utter measured thoughts with a vigour and beauty that, in later days and on a grander stage, were destined to awaken the pride of his countrymen and to command the attention of the world.

I do the day's work at the University of Virginia, where Woodrow Wilson "learned the law and the reason thereof." It came to pass that we were associated in the task of training youth, and I became his friend by reason of the ties that bind men together in such endeavour; and further, because I thought I saw in him, in a new era in the evolution of American democracy, a promise of liberal leadership and of sympathy that never slept for the disadvantaged men who bear the burdens of the world. The sturdiest romantic tradition of American public life has been the rise into power and fame of the youth who struggled up to his heights from humble and unlovely beginnings. The career of Woodrow Wilson is no part of such tradition, for his racial inheritances and cultural opportunities were about as strong and fine as an American youth can have. His forbears for eight generations belonged to the Scotch race, perhaps the most active of the intellectual aristocracies which govern the United States, modified in the direction of a kindling imagination and a quickened joy of life and battle by Celtic admixture and residence. His parents, his ancestors on both sides, and his associates on all sides were religious men and women of Presbyterian faith.

He was the son, as I have said, of a Presbyterian minister of such distinction that it was in his house that the Southern Presbyterian Church was organized when the Civil War came to rend even the religious life of the Nation. His mother was the daughter of a Presbyterian minister, in Carlisle, England. He married, in his young manhood, the daughter of a Presbyterian minister. His grandfather, Thomas Woodrow, for whom he was named, was a learned, doughty servant of God, and his uncle, James Woodrow, was a modern-minded Presbyterian minister, who, in his day, upheld stoutly against the allegation of heresy itself the banner of liberal thought and religious tolerance. His elementary and undergraduate education was under Presbyterian influences and in Presbyterian colleges—Davidson College, North Carolina, and Princeton, the college of New Jersey. Later, at the University of Virginia, in the study of law, and at Johns Hopkins University, in the study of politics and jurisprudence, he was to broaden his training and to establish a just claim as the most carefully educated man whom the people of this democracy, somewhat wary of learning and fearful lest intellectual subtlety dull the edge of common understanding, ever dared to place at the head of the Government.

Chester A. Arthur, Grover Cleveland, and Woodrow Wilson, alone, of our long presidential line, issued out of the preacher's home into public life. Cleveland and Wilson may be called the direct contributions of the Presbyterian manse to the Nation's service; and it is not without significance that the only two great successes, since 1860, of the Democratic Party, in which they now rank as titular saints, were achieved under their leadership. They were quite dissimilar in background and qualities, as a curious fate which opposed them to each other, face to face, in dour antagonism in later life made very clear, but alike in the firmness of their wills, the fixity of their conclusions, and the sensitiveness of their consciences. Surely, the great religious faith that sent forth these two American Presidents is justified of its children.

Woodrow Wilson was born in Staunton, Virginia, in the year 1856, in the middle period of the 19th Century, and, with the exception of his undergraduate years at Princeton, the first twenty-nine years of his life were passed in five Southern States, in the study of literature, history, and jurisprudence. He did not obtain at any of the colleges in which he studied a high reputation as a technical scholar. There surrounds his college career a legend of mature culture, an impression of pursuing a steadfast aim in realms of thought not included in the curriculum, an air of self-reliance untouched by eccentricity or exclusiveness; for he could be gay and charming with the choicest of his fellows and bold and assertive enough in the rough and tumble of college affairs. He had a way, even in youth, of moving amid the things of the mind and of demeaning himself in the society of books as if they had always been friends of his and he knew where he was going with them. The habit of respecting his mind and using it sternly and reverently clung to him throughout life. The sum of the college tradition about him is that he was a high-minded, proud-spirited, reflective, ambitious youth, never sturdy of body, eager to learn about men and affairs, and intent upon putting learning to use in action. The era in which he grew to manhood and the mood of the society in which his formative years were passed did much to fashion his ideals and to determine his ambitions.

The echoes of the great debate over the nature of the Union filled the air, and the towering figures of Calhoun and Webster yet dominated the imagination of opposing political schools. His early youth was passed away from, yet in the midst of, the tumult of the war which lay inherent in the logic of that debate. I am loath to praise any war, for all war is the collapse of human reason; but no sincerer war than this has occurred in human history. It was a war of ideals, of principles, of loyalty to ancient axioms of freedom, held dearer than life by both sides. The influence of the Civil War upon the youth of the man who was destined to be the Commander in Chief of all the forces of the undivided Republic in the greatest war of all time illustrates alike the calmness of his own mind and the sincerity of the mighty struggle itself. His people, post-revolutionary in American origin, had become Southern in sentiment. He records, with deep feeling, how the passing sight of the grave face and regnant figure of Robert E. Lee, long after the war, stirred the emotions of his young heart; but there was developed in him no fierce passion of sectionalism, but rather a stern and cool will to comprehend the historic forces at play within American life, and to direct those forces toward the fulfillment of the longings of democratic society.

He was of the group of young Southern-born men who knew the contributions of the South to American history, who had no apologies to offer for its part in the great struggle, ennobled by so much valour and self-sacrifice, but who felt that the South must again become whole-heartedly a part of the Federal Union it had done so much to establish. He saw about his hearthstone the faces of grim men who were subjected to such a test of manhood as our poor human nature has seldom been forced to endure. They were not men of the broadest social imagination, but they were men of intense and romantic loyalties to causes, and of an elevation of thought about the State as something to love and serve and not something to batten on or to profit by. War did not unfold to him in his far Southern home any of its marching splendours and waving banners. He saw only the filthy backwash of war, its ruin and its bitterness, cities in ashes, ignoramuses in power, revenge in action, and great leaders led away to imprisonment and obloquy.

It is true that he had heard the civil struggle ended upon a sweet, clear note of "charity to all and malice to none"; and nothing in his life shows the balance of his mind better than his quiet perception of the fact that to his youth a challenge had come to help complete unfinished social and moral tasks, unpoisoned by hate and unwasted by vengeance. It might well have been within the Almighty's inscrutable purpose to give such a man such a preparation and such a social background for a supreme far-off test, when a distraught world would have sore need of the man of faith and will who would see clearly and reason accurately, and who would not falter or turn back when once he had set his feet upon a path.

Woodrow Wilson was twenty-nine years old when he quit the formal life of a college student. One may treat as negligible the single year he spent vainly seeking to use a mind absorbed in the philosophy of law and its application to government, in the gainful practice of that profession. The span of his life was yet to stretch over thirty-seven years, and he was to spend twenty-five of those years in teaching American youth politics and government in four different institutions of learning—Bryn Mawr College, Wesleyan College, Johns Hopkins University, Princeton University. Thus, the man who was to be intrusted with the most stupendous administrative task in American history, spent three fourths of his life as student, teacher, educational administrator, and writer of books. It was not the training adapted to equip for his work a prophet of force or a master of political intrigue; Ulysses would not have prescribed it for Telemachus nor Machiavelli for his prince, but I fancy that all of us who hold the democratic faith will one day be grateful for these studious, reflective years in the life of Woodrow Wilson, when he pondered over the comparative merit of forms of government and modes of culture, when his practical mind, with its adventurous and romantic passion for action, received unfolding for a mighty purpose.

It was in the still air of these laborious days that he reflected how to get things done after the fashion of his dreaming; when he nurtured enthusiasm for men and saw himself as their servant; when, looking deep into the life of the social organism, he saw that not ideas, but ideals, conquered men's souls; when he learned calmness from Wordsworth, concentration of energy from Walter Bagehot, and with Edmund Burke discovered the real difference between a statesman and a pretender in the circumstance that one lives by the way and acts on expediency, the other lives on principles and acts for immortality; when he came to see faith as life's most substantial heroism and finally, pursuing a lonely road, gained a wide, luminous view of this world as a world ordered of God, moved by the tides of His spirit, and thus laid the basis of a fame, which one day

> Full high advanced,
> Shone like a meteor streaming to the wind.

Woodrow Wilson was the first professional teacher to pass almost directly from the classroom to the White House. Thousands of Americans today recall with gratitude his high gifts as a teacher; and as a fellow teacher, I would care to commemorate that element of his enduring service to his countrymen. To me and to the hosts of those who teach in this land, those quiet, busy years at Princeton, as a teacher, characterized by great personal happiness in a home of culture, of intense charm, energy, and growing insight, seem to constitute his real golden age. Large classes flocked to his lecture hall to applaud his varied knowledge and to gain from him new phases of life and truth. There was beauty in the cadences of his voice and power to arouse and persuade the intellect in the clarity and orderliness of his talk, brightened by bland humour and tingling wit. When he entered upon the presidency of Princeton, a new aspect of his qualities appeared. It was clear that he had thought deeply of the meaning of education and of universities, as moulding forces in a democracy. The problem of education was to him the problem of enriching the Nation's life with minds of maturity, integrity of character, and social sympathy. "What a man ought never to forget with regard to a college," he once said at Swarthmore, "is that it is a nursery of honour and principle." He inaugurated new principles of educational contact, which now lie at the core of the development, not alone of his own university, but of all institutions of liberal culture in his country.

A dramatic struggle, marked by unusual phases of bitterness and ill will, characterized his administrative career at Princeton. Universities are little worlds in themselves, and, like the greater world about them, have a way of refusing to be reformed and of preferring to be let alone, or to be reborn into new aims and processes only under tremendous pressure and the passage of slow time. The total effect on him of all this academic warfare was the hardening of his resolution, the acquisition of formidable political skill to gain his ends, the arousing of his passion for democracy, and the fixing of his purpose to rescue universities from material control. He was born to fight for the goodness which is at the heart of things, and this ideal quickly grew into an objective of freedom which caught the eye of the Nation at the precise moment when a great tide of liberal hope and opinion was flowing in and over a generation of self-satisfaction and contentment with things as they are. Unlike most cultivated Southerners of his generation, Woodrow Wilson had the impulse to write as well as to talk and became a writer of eminence fit to claim a place in the literature of his country along with Jefferson, Madison, Lincoln, and Roosevelt.

At twenty-nine he published his first book, "Congressional Government," a postgraduate thesis, revealing the actual operations of our government and outlining with a touch of genius his theory of the wisest and most efficient relation of the Executive to Congress. This book contained a definite system of political philosophy which he put into practice and to which he clung to the end of his career. In this respect a likeness to Thomas Jefferson appears, for each of them had developed, before he entered office, a definite theory of government and applied its doctrines to the solution of national problems. A series of six volumes on political and historical subjects—"Congressional Government: A Study in American Politics," "The State: Elements of Historical and Practical Politics," "Division and Reunion," "George Washington," "A History of the American People," "Constitutional Government in the United States," and five volumes of literary and social studies—"An Old Master and Other Political Essays," "Mere Literature and Other Essays," "Free Life," "The New Freedom," "When a Man Comes to Himself"—came from his pen in these days. It is impossible to read these books without concluding that the guiding motive of all his studies pointed toward political life and the goal of political office.

The opportunity to enter politics seemed worlds away to the man who was writing "mere literature" of this quality in 1895:

> There is more of a nation's politics to be got out of its poetry than out of all its systematic writers upon public affairs and constitutions. Epics are better mirrors of manners than chronicles; dramas oftentimes let you into the secrets of statutes; orations stirred by a deep energy of emotion or resolution, passionate pamphlets that survive their mission because of the direct action of their style along permanent lines of thought, contain more history than parliamentary journals. It is not knowledge that moves the world, but ideals, convictions, the opinions or fancies that have been held or followed; and whoever studies humanity ought to study it alive, practise the vivisection of reading literature, and acquaint himself with something more than anatomies which are no longer in use by spirits.

In the year 1910 Woodrow Wilson withdrew from university direction and entered active politics. His last service to education was an effort, far from successful, to give to American universities what he considered a democratic regeneration in spirit, and to bring it about that the "voices of common men should murmur in their corridors." His first political declaration was an avowal that the time had come to reconceive the liberties of America, to break the dominance of cliques and machine, to confer on candidates for high office power and responsibility for leadership, to secure for all men a fairer adjustment of human relationships; and further, that he was entering the field of politics in a new era, with no pledges to bind him and no promises to hinder him. Upon such a platform he was elected Governor of New Jersey, and in that office, and through his policies and principles, set forth in public speeches, this historian of his country, this Southern-born Scotch-Irish Presbyterian teacher, an awkward circumlocution but a deadly definition of stubborn idealism, became, in 1912, the nominee of the Democratic Party for President, received a great majority in the Electoral College, and became President of the United States on March 4, 1913.

In 1916 he was renominated and re-elected in the very midst of the greatest crisis in the secular history of mankind. I am conscious that I am summing up, in bald sentences, revolutionary transformations in the career and fortunes of an American citizen such as have seldom happened to any man in our annals, and never before to the teacher or scholar—the nearest approach in breathless action being the transfer of Abraham Lincoln from a main-street, second-story law office to unimagined burdens of authority. Both stories will for ever enrich and adorn the epic of democracy.

Woodrow Wilson once said that the true teacher or the true artist or historian must always work for the whole impression. Working in this spirit, I cannot, at this time and place, attempt even to enumerate the legislative measures which, under his leadership, went forward in the Sixty-third Congress; but I venture to claim that no such well-thought-out programme of financial, social, and industrial reform, no such inspiring spectacle of governmental efficiency and concentrated energy, no such display of fearless devotion to public interests, moving high above the plane of partisan advantage or of private gain, has been spread before the eyes of this generation as is afforded by the list of enduring enactments which crowned the accession to power of Woodrow Wilson; and I set up the further claim that a President had come upon the great scene at a time of one of those strange failures of government to redress public grievances, who had not only the will and purpose to change the note of industrial life in the Nation, and to halt the domination of American politics by its privileged financial interests, but also the sense of direction and skill to carry to some sort of fulfillment a policy of practical emancipation from materialism, and the restoration of equality of opportunity. The Congress that furnished the teamwork in this memorable period of legislative energy was admirable and intelligent; but leadership lay in the President, not by use of patronage or by social amenities, but by the steady drive of intellectual force which his opponents within and without his party could not resist.

The new President concluded his first inaugural with these words:

> The Nation has been deeply stirred; stirred by a solemn passion, stirred by the knowledge of wrong, of ideals lost, of government too often debauched and made an instrument of evil. The feelings with which we face this new age of right and opportunity sweep across our heartstrings like some air out of God's own presence, where justice and mercy are reconciled and the judge and the brother are one. We know our task to be no mere task of politics, but a task which shall search us through and through, whether we be able to understand our time and the need of our people, whether we be indeed their spokesman and interpreter, whether we have the pure heart to comprehend and the rectified will to choose our high course of action. This is not a day of triumph; it is a day of dedication. I summon all honest men, all patriotic, all forward-looking men, to my side. God helping me, I will not fail them, if they will but counsel and sustain me!

Passionate sincerity shines out of these moving words. It was a spiritual moment in our history. Men were looking at life with kinder and juster eyes. A new spokesman of humanity endowed with power to diagnose the causes of domestic derangement had appeared in our politics, with a will and a purpose and a programme. An eager and a nipping air seemed to blow away the atmosphere of materialism which had in varying degree hung over the Capital since Lincoln's day. Not since Jefferson had a leader with such a programme dwelt at Washington. If in seventeen months a world war had not come to turn the thoughts of mankind to the defence of civilization itself, it is not immoderate to believe that the great reforms already inaugurated would have been followed by others equally vital, and the domestic policy of the Nation ordered in accordance with the best liberal thought of modern, self-governing communities.

But war came, apparently falling out of the blue, like some tragic drama of the high gods, upon a busy and peaceful people, bent upon working out here in a favoured land some scheme of life by which every man should have liberty, without hindrance, to be what God made him. In reality, there had arrived the moment of explosion of confined passions and forces long gathering through the ages, the awful fruitage of centuries of human greed and incompetence, of malignant nationalistic ambitions, of scientific progress diverted from high ends to purposes of destruction, of vain and feeble puppets in places of power, of a European polity based on fear and balance of power, rather than reason and concert of action. In the twinkling of an eye, our gain-getting age became a brawling age of terror and revolution, to be thought of hereafter as the end of an old epoch and the beginning of a new epoch in human annals.

It has been often predicted that this greatest drama in history must needs be one day really written as a drama by some Æschylus who will paint the darkening sky, the rushing of the wind, the tension of the time, as catastrophe leapt to catastrophe, the movements of the bewildered antagonists amid the muttering of the storm and the lightning. In such a drama alone could one hope to find a just portrait of the peace-loving figure of the American scholar President, as he lifts his shoulders to the burdens, seeks to readjust his mind and nature, absorbed in purposes of new freedom for common men, to the tasks of the dreadful hour, and with tragic loneliness and patience grapples with events.

I saw President Wilson for the last time in the fullness of his strength on the evening of April 2, 1917. He was standing at this desk, speaking the momentous words which were to lead this democracy into war, and to teach all free peoples, then bewildered and depressed, the meaning of the conflict, and to lift up their hearts. All mankind was his audience. The air of this hall was tense with emotion, and the dullest sensed the historic significance of the great scene. There were then etched into my mind, in lines never to be erased, the face and form and manner of Woodrow Wilson—the lithe figure, the bony structure of the forehead, the lean, long visage as of a covenanter, sombre with fixed purpose. The culture of generations was in his tones, the scholar's artistry in his words, the inheritance of a gentleman's breeding in his manner, and calm courage in his discerning eyes. I was somehow reminded of the unbending lineaments and figure of Andrew Jackson, whom Woodrow Wilson resembled physically; and, in the very soul of him, morally exhibiting the same grim resolution, as of a stranger to the fear that weaklings feel.

The direction of American affairs, as the Republic swept into the current of the World War, was in the hands of a liberal statesman, bred of democracy, firm of will, jealous of his country's honour, gifted with power to argue with cogency, capable of seeing far ahead the movements of social progress, incapable of fear, unmoved by passion or greed of conquest, intent upon justice, dreaming of peace and the righting of immemorial wrongs. I do not intend a résumé of the events of the two years and eight months intervening between the onset of war and the entrance of America into the struggle, but rather an analysis of what Prof. L. P. Jacks, a thoughtful English scholar to whom I am indebted for a better understanding of Woodrow Wilson, once called the "war mind" of Woodrow Wilson. To have taken any other primary step than the issuance of a declaration of neutrality in August, 1914, would have been the act of a madman or a superman, and Mr. Wilson was merely the trustee of the most powerful country on earth hitherto dedicated to the tradition of its own nonintervention in foreign affairs and the noninterference of European nations in cisatlantic problems.

The country was unfamiliar with European complications and unaware of the new international position decided for them, in Theodore Roosevelt's words, by fate and the march of events. Even the intellectuals who grasped the truth that the war was a conflict between two opposing schools of civilization would have been shocked by any other initial policy than the policy of neutrality. Military glory as an end in itself held no lure for President Wilson and no power to confuse his judgment, as his course in Mexico and his Mobile declaration had shown. I have little doubt as to where lay his sympathies from the first hour of the conflict, but he was not the man in a position of vast responsibility to be swayed by sympathy or prejudice or self-interest. Rather, he was the man, careless of fleeting judgments, to seek the position of moral responsibility imposed upon the United States and to so place its power at the service of mankind that other ages would hold it in grateful remembrance. I have read the speeches of President Wilson from the beginning of the war to its end, and I find in them an amazing strength and unity. I am not troubled by the inconsistency of his early advocacy of peace and his later proclamation of "force to the limit," for there is no inconsistency.

As Lincoln with supreme wisdom planted his policy not on slavery but on union, Woodrow Wilson with a similar greatness tied his policy to the idea that the United States, the most powerful of all States, should be a servant, a minister, a friend, not a master among the nations. Never before in the history of mankind has a statesman of the first order made the humble doctrine of service to humanity a cardinal and guiding principle of world politics. As long as he thought this principle was best served by neutrality, we kept out of the war. The long series of diplomatic papers, the patience that endured the barbarism of the *Lusitania* and bore without flinching the contumely of foes and the misgivings of friends, may justly be thought of as mere incidents in the evolution of this great idea. When at last the insolent brutality of the renewal of submarine warfare taught him that force alone could advance his doctrine, he took us into war. His much derided Notes to the Imperial German Government deserve rank among the enduring documents of international history and constitute one of the most decisive arguments ever addressed to the conscience of civilization, to illustrate the solemn hesitation that ought to mark the course of rulers who carry nations into war, to give proof that in such a collapse of civilization, at least one nation should retain its poise, and to unite his countrymen while he taught the world.

When on March 5, 1914, before the war, in discussing the Panama tolls, he said, "We are too big, too powerful, too self-respecting a nation to interpret with too strained or refined a reading the words of our own promises, just because we have power enough to give us leave to read them as we please," he made clear all that subsequently possessed his mind. When a year later he said, "We do not want anything that does not belong to us. Is not a nation in that position free to serve other nations?" he revealed the heart of his policy; and so when, on the memorable night of April 2d, he asked Congress to acknowledge a state of war, it was to a crusade, not to a war, that his statesmanlike policy had brought his countrymen; and they could not doubt that the diplomatic victory was his, the moral victory was his, that a mighty people were behind him, that the leadership of mankind rested where democracy on a continental scale had begun, in the American Republic.

In December, 1916, the President had sought through a statement by each side of its war aims to discover if any basis of peace might be found. This inquiry exhibited diplomatic genius of the first order, for it enraged the Germans and aided the Allies to consolidate their moral position before the world. The great achievement was obscured for a moment by a storm of obloquy from superheated patriots who misread the grim humour and misinterpreted his precise language when he declared that all sides, according to their own general statement to their own people, had the same aims.

Again, on January 22, 1917, Mr. Wilson for the last time sought mediation in a speech in which he defined the fundamental conditions of a permanent peace. No greater state paper than this exists in the records of modern states. The result of this masterstroke was to bring us nearer war, but also nearer to lasting peace, to establish him still more closely as the one dispassionate voice of mankind, and again to bring upon him an outburst of condemnation for his noblest pre-war utterance in which he used, but explained none too skillfully, the phrase "peace without victory," by which he meant that only a reconciled Europe could be a tranquil and stable Europe, and that community of power must succeed balance of power.

Still preoccupied with the thought of lasting peace, Mr. Wilson appeared before the Congress in the early winter of 1918, at the darkest moment of the allied fortunes, and formulated fourteen points of peace. These generalizations were almost revolutionary in their scope and idealism and ultimately formed the general basis of the peace to be drafted; but they carried, too, a political adroitness aiming directly at putting an end to the fighting. They planted new seeds of aspiration and new hopes of justice between nations in the minds of men; and it is not easy to ostracize such ideas. Its timeliness, as well as its strength, gives to this document a place among the great charters which have marked the progress of mankind. Our other great papers, the Declaration, the Farewell Address, Virginia Bill of Rights, the Constitution, were local or continental in their application. This paper, and the complementary addresses following it, aimed at nothing less than to endow the broken and weary nations with a new order and a new life. Desperate peoples for an hour looked into the shining face of Hope, and had sight of an old heaven and a new earth arising out of horror but ennobled by the self-sacrifice of millions. In Burke's vivid phrase, he was now the Lord of the Ascendant; his speeches had the strength of battalions along the front of battle; his voice was the voice of free peoples; and all over the earth, in the great capitals, among the tribes of the desert, in the islands of the sea, men felt the moulding of his thought and sensed the grandeur of his aims.

The conversion of American energies into war energies, the transformation of the American spirit and philosophy of life into war spirit and war philosophy, the actual throwing into the furnace of modern war, across 3,000 miles of sea, the resources of men and money and resolution of the American people, takes rank among the greatest practical enterprises of mankind. It may well be conceded that mistakes were made and that judgments went wrong; but "it is the grim silence of facts that counts." Military experts impartially chosen, not political generals, commanded armies in this war. No congressional committees, as in former wars, directed its strategy and confused its processes. No serious bickerings or scandals or conflicts marred the unity of its course. Far-seeing fiscal and economic legislation gave steadiness to the Nation in the vast undertaking. Men and materials flowed to the armies in the field. The genius of the army and navy displayed itself in war. The genius of the President struck down the enemy morale and laid the foundations of peace. No democracy in history and few autocracies have ever given such an exhibition of efficient co-operation or earned such triumphant success.

The logic of events, to which Wilson's matchless skill in exhortation and argument had contributed so much, now decreed that in ten months ancient dynasties would abdicate and flee, and that under American leadership the mighty war would come to an end, an armistice would be declared, and a peace conference come into being. Long generations hence we shall warm our hearts at the fire of the glory that then shone about this Republic, won for it by the steadfast mind of its President, the unity of its people, the disinterestedness of its purposes, and the valour of its youth unafraid to die.

On December 12th the George Washington, steaming through long lines of gray battleships over a gray sea amid the roar of guns and shoutings, dropped anchor at Brest, and an American President, for the first time, appeared in Europe to take part in a parliament of nations assembled to determine for years to come the course of history. Whether he should have gone at all, or only once, or by whom he should have been accompanied is a sea of fascinating but futile conjecture, upon which I shall not embark. Woodrow Wilson was not a master of manipulating men or of dramatizing himself, but a master and in some sense a slave of ideas and ideals. It seemed to him that it was his moral responsibility, under God, to go to Europe, heedless of the rocks ahead of him and the whirlpools behind him. It was a fearful responsibility to assume, for all the peace congresses of civilization, from Westphalia and Vienna to Paris, had satisfied nobody and had generally broken their creators. This congress was the gigantic legatee of the failures of all past congresses, and in none of these congresses of the past did any one man, not Talleyrand or Metternich or Disraeli or Bismarck, ever occupy a position of such terrible greatness.

I am sure Aristotle's fine summary of tragedy must often have visited his mind as his ship wended her way across the seas:

> Tragedy, in its pure idea, shows us a mortal will engaged in an unequal struggle with destiny, whether that destiny be represented by the forces within or without the mind. The conflict reaches its tragic issue when the individual perishes; but, through his ruin, the disturbed order of the world is restored and the moral forces reassert their sway.

Three underlying ideas and purposes, all born of American daring and American experience, guided his mind and drove him on. The first was faith in the whole kindling length and logic of democracy itself; faith in men, faith in the supremacy of spiritual force, given new sacredness by what he saw about him of suffering and death. The second was the essential democratic idea of the right of men everywhere to determine their own affairs. The third was the idea of co-operation of peoples, the partnership of opinion among democratic nations, which once had welded discordant states in a new world into a Federal Union, and might again weld discordant peoples in an old world into a parliament of man.

For six months, at the Congress of Paris, in an alien air surcharged with cynicism and suspicion, almost single-handed he fought for these principles, buoyed and sustained in the first period of his struggle by high tides of hope and faith that surged up to him out of the bruised hearts of peoples who trusted him to lead them over the failure of brute force into God's peace, and in the second period buffeted by the ebb tides of fading enthusiasm, of disintegrating unity, of selfish dominion, and ancient fears.

He had gone to Paris with the "fourteen points of peace," accepted alike by his Allies and by the Central Powers as the basis for the coming settlement. The "fourteen points" lived in his mind as a doctrine of international justice, and the League of Nations was an integral part thereof, conceived as the medium to interpret and administer those principles of justice, and to introduce into the relations of modern states the idea of organic international co-operation based on reason. No man could have achieved this programme in its entirety or secured a perfect peace of justice at Paris. Statesmanship of the most transcendent form could not have diagnosed, much less healed, that tremendous ailment of the world. The Versailles treaty, though a huge advance over any one of the five great treaties since Westphalia in sympathy and counsel with the peoples concerned, in the redress of bitter wrongs, in consideration for the weak and thought of the future, proved to be not God's peace. It was a peace shot through with the fear and resentment of suffering and ill-used men; a settlement corrupted by previous bargains among the Allied Powers made under the lure of traditional policies and the stern necessities of war and inconsistent with the high purpose of the charter which Wilson had presented for the guidance of the congress.

When the odium of nations and races began to beat upon him because he could not perform a task beyond mortal achievement, Wilson saw himself confronted with the alternative of world-wide chaos and disintegration or an imperfect peace with the League of Nations. He could not, with his vast sense of political and social institutions, postpone by headstrong and wilful conduct the normal and peaceful ordering of men's lives.

Woodrow Wilson was not a revolutionist. Political reform by "red ruin and the breaking up of laws" was not in his blood. He chose the League of Nations, surrendering, in the anguish of compromise, such portions of his doctrine of international justice as he could not get. I am of those who believe that he gained more than he sacrificed at Versailles, and I know that he alone among mortal men could have salvaged out of that sea of passion the League of Nations, the bravest and most reasonable effort to rationalize national relations in political history. The statement sometimes made that he fell, beaten down by the superior adroitness and intelligence of his European colleagues, is a piece of analysis entitling its author to a high place in any hierarchy of inferior minds. What was liberal in the Versailles treaty Wilson's faith and courage helped to put there. What was reactionary he fought against to the limit of his strength and accepted only to gain an instrument which he believed had in it power to purge and correct.

He had the heart to match the moral hopes of mankind against their passions. He sought to give the 20th Century a faith to inspire it and to justify the sacrifice of millions of lives; and if there was failure, in Jan Smuts's words, it was humanity's failure. To make him, the one and undaunted advocate of those hopes, the scapegoat of a world collapse is to visit upon him injustice so cruel that it must perish of its own unreason. Therefore, I do not envisage Woodrow Wilson as a failure as he came back to these shores bearing in his hands the covenant of the league and the imperfect treaty itself. I envisage him rather as a victor and conqueror as he returned to America, unstained by sordidness or dishonour, unsurpassed in moral devotion, and offering to his country leadership in the broadest and worthiest cause in all the story of human struggle for a better life. What statesman in the history of world adjustment in defence of a code of shining, if unattainable, idealism had ever borne himself more stoutly or battled with such foes or achieved with so little support at home or abroad, so astounding a result?

When President Wilson first sailed for Europe in December, 1918, American sentiment, irrespective of party, generally approved his declared purpose to incorporate in the treaty of peace some sort of league covenant. The heart of the time was then in tune with the age-old dream. The President of the United States had a right to assume that the American people were behind him on the issue of the League of Nations, notwithstanding the adverse verdict of the electorate on his general policies. Eight years before, in 1910, in his Nobel lecture, Theodore Roosevelt himself said:

> It would be a master stroke if those great Powers honestly bent on peace would form a league of peace, not only to keep the peace among themselves, but to prevent, by force if necessary, its being broken by others. The man or statesman who should bring about such a condition would have earned his place in history for all time and his title to the gratitude of all mankind.

A list of eminent Americans of all parties then in line with that pronouncement in 1918 would be an illuminating contribution to the higher impulses of that era.

When he returned a different spectacle met his eyes. The great cause for which he had even then given his life had become confused with a group of political policies given by his enemies the generic name of Wilsonism, and about this raged the wrath, despair, and hatred of the overstrained time. The tired warrior of the common good, who had kept the faith, fought the fight, and won a victory, instead of hearing the acclaim of his own people, "Well done, thou good and faithful servant," saw himself ringed about with foes of mind to rend and destroy him.

I cannot give time here to determining whether Wilson himself was to blame, in tactical judgment alone, or how much he was to blame for the change in American opinion; nor do I deny that honest men opposed the league and the treaty; nor do I undertake the task of apportioning with nice justice the responsibility for the cauldron of heat and "swelter'd venom" of deadlock and indecision, of partisanship and passion, in which for weary months this largest question of modern times boiled and bubbled. Other ages will make that solemn appraisement. I may be permitted the reflection that something less of malice in the hearts of his enemies, and something more of compromise in his own heart, and something more of political genius and firm purpose in the hearts of those who held the faith, and there might have been another world!

I have lately been reading, and I wish all of his countrymen might one day quietly read, the thirty speeches made by the President on that fateful Western tour which he undertook in September, 1919, in order to secure from the American people the stamp of approval which he desired for his work in Europe, and which the American Senate was unwilling to give. There is no series of political speeches, made under circumstances of such strain, in our annals attaining a higher level of oratory and exposition. He was forewarned, as he fared forth, that his life might be the forfeit of his enterprise. He replied, "I would forfeit my life to attain the end I seek," and he meant it; for he was incapable of melodramatic pose, and the consecration of that statement runs like a thread of gold through the sustained appeal.

Undeterred by the stabbing of physical pain and failing strength, Woodrow Wilson here reveals the scope and depth of his conviction that national isolation for America or any country is for ever ended; that the outlawry of war is democracy's next great task; that suicide hovers over civilization in the present system of the relation of states and the present potentialities of destructive warfare; that the hour has struck for the creation of an instrument to gather behind it the organized manhood of the world, bent upon evolving a clearer international conscience a firmer international law substituting reason for passion in human affairs, and that the covenant of the League of Nations is such an instrument if mankind will but adapt it to its uses.

This is the Wilsonism that the quiet justice of humanity will remember throughout the ages. But all this force and eloquence and martyrdom were to avail nothing. Woodrow Wilson fell stricken as if in battle at Pueblo, Colorado, on September 25, 1919, and came home shorn of his unmatched strength to persuade and move the hearts of his countrymen.

The American Senate, in the plain discharge of its constitutional duty, discussed the treaty for a period of eight months, during five months of which period the President struggled against mortal illness, rejected it on March 20th, and elected to remain outside the first organized scheme of international co-operation in modern history.

The last words spoken to the people at Pueblo by the President were these:

> Now that the mists of this great question have cleared away, I believe that men will see the truth, eye to eye and face to face. There is one thing that the American people always rise to and extend their hand to, and that is the truth of justice, liberty, and peace. We have accepted that truth, and it is going to lead us, and through us the world, out into pastures of quietness and peace such as this world never dreamed of before.

The prophecy of the stricken advocate of reason has not yet come true. There are those who hope and believe that it will never come true. It is not seemly that I should here attempt any controversial discussion; but I should lack the courage of the man I seek to interpret if I did not, as an American citizen, cry out, even in this chamber, God grant that it may come true and gain new authority to protect mankind against its imminent dangers.

It is commonly said that the historic rank of Woodrow Wilson is wrapped up in the destiny of the covenant; that if it fails, his rank will be merely that of one more radiant spirit whose reach exceeded his grasp, and if it succeeds, his apotheosis in history is secure. I find the formula too glib and automatic for the forces and ideas it presumes to envelop. Apotheosis and immortality are weighty words that ill fit our poor flesh, so foredoomed to the iniquity of earthly oblivion;

but surely the fame of Woodrow Wilson does not rest upon an instrument the orderly growth of which into final usefulness may so change its structure and modify its form as to cause it to become another and an even better instrument. It depends upon an unconquerable idea, so greatly conceived and set forth that it must continue to grow and is now growing into new and finer form, and his fame must grow with it into whatever bright renown it may attain.

Posterity will be eager to have knowledge of the personality and the salient qualities of a statesman set apart to play such a rôle in the world's affairs. I shall picture him as I knew him—not the Wilson whom mankind will remember as the stern war leader of a mighty nation; but another Wilson, known to me—a Wilson of sprightliness and humour and handsome courtesy, of kindly countenance and fascinating conversation with power to "beguile you into being informed beyond your worth, and wise beyond your birthright." The sensitive shyness and reserve that clings to men who cannot capitalize their personal advantages to win friends clung to him. Intimacies were sacred relations to his spirit, but these intimacies could not overflow into inveterate amiability. He did not wear his heart on his sleeve for daws to peck at; but tenderness governed his demeanour with those he trusted; and he wore about him a quiet grace of dignity.

Woodrow Wilson was a deeply religious man. Men who do not understand the religious spirit need not even try to understand him. No man in supreme power in any nation's life, since Gladstone, was so profoundly penetrated by the Christian faith. He was sturdily and mystically Christian. He took God Almighty in earnest as the Supreme Reality, and he carried Him into his home and saw His immanence and guidance in private and public life. He had the habit of prayer, and he read and reread the English Bible. Through all his speeches flamed the glory of an insistent belief that morality and politics should march hand in hand. Many of his tendencies, perhaps the most of them that occasioned debate and censure, sprang from his pragmatic belief in God. There was actually such a thing as God's will to this man; and when he thought he had divined that will, he knew the right, the absolute right, and he was prepared to stand on that, if friends deserted him or he parted company with friends, if applause came or if the blow fell. "Interest divides men; what unites them is the common pursuit of right," was one of his great utterances, and not unlike the stout-hearted old mediæval bishops, he stood ready to wield sword or bludgeon if the foe showed his face. "God save us from compromise." "Let's stop being merely practical, and find out what's right," were phrases often on his lips.

It was the Christian philosophy at work in his spirit that placed him almost instinctively on the side of the common man and against the privileged and the powerful. Wilson could be, and sometimes was, aloof and unrelenting to this or that friend or foe; but mankind, in the mass, never failed to soften his spirit and awaken his emotions. He would have gone to the stake to protect mankind, as a whole, from tyranny and injustice; but the ambitions of any individual man, even a friend, stirred him slightly. His greatest defect as a leader of men was this shrinking from human contacts at close range. When he had proved the rightness of his case and stated it boldly, a strange moral fastidiousness and loyalty to the overlordship of reason prevented him from seeking to win men to his side by talking it over in whispers or by sweet and soothing persuasiveness. As Augustine Birrel said of Carlyle, "It seemed to him to be his duty to teach, not to tickle mankind." This inhibition left him a master of ideas, but not a master of using men, and substituted admiration and respect for love and enthusiasm in the nature of the mass of his followers.

Wilson evoked no such popular devotion as did Henry Clay or James G. Blaine or Theodore Roosevelt. Men of his prophetic quality rarely do. Edmund Burke once said of Charles James Fox, with a deep sigh, "He was made to be loved." That sigh often, no doubt, stirred in Woodrow Wilson's heart. He was a selfless man in so far as personal glory or profit was concerned.

It was "perfection, not renown" that allured him. It was God's praise, not men's praise, that gave him strength. The ambition which drove him to pre-eminence was the ambition to create new ideals or to reillumine old, neglected ones. Intellectually, he does not belong with Kant or Burke or Hamilton or John Marshall; but he had a brain of high order, functioning in a different atmosphere and a broader field, a brain which worked straight and quick; and he suffered ill, fools and those of untidy minds. I should call his greatest mental gifts the power to look into the future, to assemble facts, to marshal his propositions in due order, to generalize fairly, and to state his interpretations with such terseness and soundness that they sank into minds that listened.

As an Executive, he was not an incarnation of action like Napoleon or Roosevelt. The lightning decision was not after his manner; but his industry was tireless, his judgment of men sound, and his mind did its own thinking, and men could not frighten or deceive or cajole him. The possession of a tenacious memory enabled him to keep the whole before him, to dispense with threshing around, and to dread irrelevance and bombast. No dogmatism or abruptness controlled his relations to men who approached his problem from the same angle. He gave his entire trust to those who worked with him, defended them against injustice, and upheld them against slander or misrepresentation.

The world used to be full of people busy in discerning, imagining, and cataloguing the faults of Woodrow Wilson. Dogmatist and hermit, rhetorician and pacifist, egocentric and ingrate, dreamer and drifter were some of the milder coinages of his more civil and restrained enemies. Well, he had his faults. I am not here to portray or to defend his faults. Some of them were protective devices to conserve physical strength, and others lay buried deep in the impulses in his blood; but inhibitions born of pride and courage and high ambition are such as nations learn to forget and to forgive, and even to love and cherish. Posterity is incurious about the minor faults of its heroes. England does not concern itself with the flaws of Nelson and William

Pitt. Men do not remember Andrew Jackson's stubbornness and prejudice. They recall only the fury and fire of his purpose to preserve the Federal Union.

His countrymen will not for ever remember the volubility and histrionic arts of Theodore Roosevelt, but they will never let die the memory of the valiant force of him penetrating the Nation's spirit, increasing the sum of its energies, awakening youth to high adventure, and stridently proclaiming the glory of upright living. They do not tattle about Washington's blazing profanity at Monmouth, but see his stately figure riding into the storm of battle beneath the tattered flag of a new nation he would fain bring into the world. They do not whisper about Lincoln's choice of companions or his taste in anecdotes or his cunning in politics; but they read incised on white marble walls the sacred poems which his literary genius has left to posterity, behold him in the night watches correcting his mistakes and using even his humility as a sword with which to carve out the victory of his cause. And so it will be with Woodrow Wilson in the long perspective of the years. The destiny in his blood decided that he should possess—

> The unconquerable will . . .
> And courage never to submit or yield,
> And what is else not to be overcome.

He had the thirst for fame and human remembrance that belongs to all great natures. It was not easy for him to forget or to forgive. The pride of righteousness sometimes froze the more genial currents of his soul, but he was willing to die, and did die, to guarantee to humble men a fairer chance in a juster world, and therefore the savage assaults of his enemies will shrivel into the insignificance of Horace Greeley's editorials against Lincoln's policies, or the futility of the early century pamphleteers against Thomas Jefferson as iconoclast and antichrist, and his mere detractors will themselves either attain a repellent fame as detractors of greatness or else they will pass out of memory and no one will ask

Who or what they have been
More than he asks what waves
Of the midmost ocean have swelled,
Foamed for a moment and gone.

The four closing years in the life of Woodrow Wilson were harsh, unheroic, uninspiring years in public affairs, such as generally follow the emotional climaxes of war, and it is a commonplace to describe them as years of personal tragedy to him. A vast disillusionment, a chaos miscalled peace, a kind of shamefacedness and cynicism in the recollection of its dreams and faith in the triumph of moral ideals, seemed to hold the nation and the world in its grasp. As far as Woodrow Wilson himself was concerned, it is well perhaps not to confuse the bodily pain, the palsied side, and all the cold malignities of the time with the essential meaning of those years. Adversity had been wanting in his career, and now it was come upon him, and he was to have acquaintance with its sublime refinement, and the country was to gain knowledge of its power to smite the hearts of just men with love for the baffled fighter who had known none too much of popular affection in his career of self-reliant conquest.

He carried his head high in the dying days of his public service, omitting no duty his strength could bear, meeting the gracious courtesy of his successor at the end with an equal courtesy, as they rode away from the White House, so deeply associated in American history with memories of sorrow and pain, as well as pomp and power, while unseen of human eyes to each of them alike "tragedy with sceptred pall comes sweeping by."

In the days left to him as the first private citizen of the Republic, unlike Burke, he did not waste his strength in windy opposition or factious controversy. He wrote no memoirs. "With my historical sense, how could I be my own biographer?" he said. He exploited in no way his wide fame, uttered no complaint, suffered no pity, displayed no vainglory. It was as if a great gentleman, "weary of the weight of this unintelligible world," sought his peace at last in a quiet home luminous with love and perfect care, and shut out at last from the noises and the storm. From this sanctuary, day by day, it was given him to behold the processes of his own immortality, as simple men and women gathered about his home and perceived in his wan image the poignant symbol of their days and the historic link for ever binding them to noble enthusiasms.

The very depth and dignity of his silence won through to the imagination of men, and when he spoke, the world stood at attention heartened to have knowledge that his high hopes for mankind were undimmed, and that there was no faltering in that firm faith of his that liberty guided by reason and not by force was the contribution of his century to human advancement. I doubt not that regrets came to vex his mind for lost opportunities that might have been better used as he reviewed the pageant of his days in that long sequestered time; but a durable satisfaction fortified his soul, that even the devil's advocate must bear witness that—

He had loved no darkness,
Sophisticated no truth,
Allowed no fear.

A grace which his heart craved came in the exaltation and excitement of a valiant new generation on the march, intent to light its torches at the still burning fire of his purpose to substitute for the arbitrament of war and death the reign of law, to restore to the land of his love and his loyalty its surrendered ascendancy, and to guarantee to the principles he had fought for eternal validity. The puzzle and complex of his dual nature seemed at last to fall into a mould of simplicity and consistency.

> We die but once, and we die without distinction if we are not willing to die the death of sacrifice. Honour and distinction come only as rewards for service to mankind.

Thus Woodrow Wilson had spoken in the days of his strength to high-hearted American youth, and now, broken in body but crowned with bays, he could of right claim the supreme distinction as his very own! And so even as death enfolded him in its shadows, men paused in their busy lives and came to comprehend that a man of great faith had lived in their era, akin in heart and blood to John Milton and John Hampden, Mazzini, and Luther, that a prophet had guided their country and stirred the heart of mankind in an hour of destiny, and that an incorruptible liberal aflame with will to advance the slow ascent of man had joined those whom men call immortal and stood among that high fellowship,

> Constant as the Northern Star
> Of whose true, fixed, and lasting quality,
> There is no fellow in the firmament.

From "Woodrow Wilson—Memorial Address" delivered by Edwin Anderson Alderman, Doubleday, Page & Co. By permission of the author and publishers.

PART III

Speeches that combine complete rhetorical preparation with a sense of the presence of the audience.

OF FAME

HENRY VAN DYKE

Henry van Dyke is known as clergyman—for many years pastor of the Brick Presbyterian Church, Fifth Avenue, New York; as author—of forty-two volumes of verse and prose; as professor—of English literature at Princeton University; and as diplomat—United States minister to the Netherlands and Luxemburg, under President Wilson. Doctor van Dyke was born in Germantown, Pennsylvania, in 1852. He was graduated from Princeton in 1873 and from the Princeton Theological Seminary in 1877, and took his doctorate in 1884. The D.C.L. of Oxford, 1917, was the last of many honorary degrees conferred upon him.

The speech "Of Fame" was given at the Hall of Fame, New York University, May 21, 1921. Students of English Literature will recall its Baconian prototype.

In the Usage of the Ancients, Fame was a Neutral Word, signifying no more than a wide Repute, whether for Good or Evil. But in our own Times it has risen to a Moral Estate; so that we call a great Benefactor, *Famous*, but a great Tyrant, *Infamous*. Celebrity has a confessed touch of the Transient; and Notoriety an accent of Suspicion or Contempt; yet under both these Titles men may be much talked of. But Fame is a Nobler Word. *Fame is a Durable Good Renown, earned by Service, approved by the Wise, and applauded by the Common Voice.* Fame is to Notoriety what a solemn Music is to a loud Noise.

The Electors of the Hall are not chosen to Confer Fame, but only to Recognize it. For this they have need of Observation, Judgment, Patience, and an Open Mind. Wherein they follow Prejudice, their action will be too Narrow; but if led by Favour, it will be too Loose. In any case they must admit the possibility of Mistake and consequent Reproach; for had they been Infallible they would not have accepted the Difficult Office of Electors. Yet it must be noted that of the two kinds of Blame which they may incur, one is more Grave than the other. An Error of Omission may be Repaired at the following Election; but an Error of Inclusion may hardly be Remedied without Ridicule. Therefore in the Inscription of Tablets the maxim of *Augustus Cæsar* is good; *Festina Lente.* Yet it does not please the Crowd, which discovers new Great Men every year, and crowns them with Deciduous Laurel.

In a Young Country, already full-grown of Ambition, Celebrity springs easily from the ground, having the hand of Local Pride to help it. But true Fame is of slower Growth, being hindered by Local Jealousy, and the Latent Envy of Democracy. There is also a certain Concealed Fear of the Opinion of Older Nations, and this often hides itself under the form of Unseemly Boasting. Yet neither the Fear nor the Boasting are of great account in the Right Reckoning of Fame. Standards we must have, but let us draw them from Antiquity. Not with Modern Europe but with Greece and Rome let America compare her Harvest of Manhood, thereby to learn Modesty, Self-Respect, and Courage.

He that professes to care naught for Fame deceives himself, or else he is bilious. Yet if he seeks it directly, he goes the wrong way to obtain it. Let him seek first Duty and Virtue and Service; then can he be happy with his Reward or without it.

No Fame of mortals is Eternal unless it has a Godlike Quality. May no Names be written on these Walls except those that are Lovely and of Good Report—names of men and women who have Served Humanity in their Day and Generation and Deserved Well of the Republic.

By permission of the author.

LINCOLN AS AN ORATOR

WILLIAM JENNINGS BRYAN

William Jennings Bryan was an orator, a politician and statesman, a lawyer, and a newspaper publisher. He had been a member of the Fifty-second and Fifty-third Congresses, and editor of the Omaha *World-Herald,* when he was chosen a delegate to the Democratic National Convention of 1896, where he wrote the "silver plank" into the platform of his party, made his famous "Cross of Gold" speech, and was nominated for President of the United States. In 1900 he was again nominated for the Presidency, and a third time in 1908. He was appointed Secretary of State in the first cabinet of President Wilson, but resigned in 1915.

Mr. Bryan, though born at Salem, Illinois (1860), was for most of his active life identified with Nebraska. He was an LL.B. of the University of Nebraska, and it was at Lincoln that he established his political magazine, *The Commoner.* He was a strong prohibition advocate. He died suddenly in 1925 while at Dayton, Tennessee, where as volunteer counsel for the Board of Education, he had defended the Bible against Darwinism.

Known as the "silver-tongued" orator, Mr. Bryan was indefatigable as a Chautauqua lecturer and political speaker. This speech on Lincoln he delivered at Springfield, Illinois, February 12, 1909, on the centenary of Lincoln's birth. The speech is a fair example of Mr. Bryan's ability, although other addresses of his are more notable. It offers, besides a condensed review of Lincoln's life and speaking ability, many valuable hints to speakers.

LINCOLN'S fame as a statesman and as the Nation's chief executive during its most crucial period has so overshadowed his fame as an orator that his merits as a public speaker have not been sufficiently emphasized. When it is remembered that his nomination was directly due to the prominence which he won upon the stump; that in a remarkable series of debates he held his own against one of the most brilliant orators America has produced;

and that to his speeches, more than to the arguments of any other one man, or, in fact, of all other public men combined, was due the success of his party—when all these facts are borne in mind, it will appear plain, even to the casual observer, that too little attention has been given to the extraordinary power which he exercised as a speaker. That his nomination was due to the effect that his speeches produced, cannot be disputed. When he began his fight against slavery in 1858, he was but little known outside of the counties in which he attended court. It is true that he had been a member of Congress some years before, but at that time he was not stirred by any great emotion connected with the discussion of any important theme, and he made but little impression upon National politics. The threatened extension of slavery, however, aroused him, and with a cause which justified his best efforts, he threw his whole soul into the fight. The debates with Douglas have never had a parallel in this, or, so far as history shows, in any other country.

In engaging in this contest with Douglas, he met a foeman worthy of his steel, for Douglas had gained a deserved reputation as a great debater, and recognized that his future depended upon the success with which he met the attacks of Lincoln. On one side an institution supported by history and tradition, and on the other a growing sentiment against the holding of a human being in bondage—these presented a supreme issue. Douglas won the senatorial seat for which the two at that time had contested, but Lincoln won a larger victory—he helped to mold the sentiment that was dividing parties and re-arranging the political map of the country. When the debates were concluded, every one recognized him as the leader of the cause which he had espoused, and it was a recognition of this leadership which he had secured through his public speeches that enabled him, a Western man, to be nominated over the Eastern candidates —not only a Western man, but a man lacking in book learning and the polish of the schools. No other American President has ever so clearly owed his elevation to his oratory. Washington, Jefferson, and Jackson, the Presidents usually mentioned in connection with him, were all poor speakers.

In analyzing Lincoln's characteristics as a speaker, one is impressed with the completeness of his equipment. He possessed the two things that are absolutely essential to effective speaking—namely, information and earnestness. If one can be called eloquent who knows what he is talking about and means what he says—and I know of no better definition—Lincoln's speeches were eloquent. He was thoroughly informed upon the subject; he was prepared to meet his opponent upon the general proposition discussed, and upon any deductions which could be drawn from it. There was no unexplored field into which his adversary could lead him; he had carefully examined every foot of the ground, and was not afraid of pitfall or ambush, and what was equally important, he spoke from his own heart to the hearts of those who listened. While the printed page cannot fully reproduce the impressions made by a voice trembling with emotion or tender with pathos, one cannot read the reports of the debates without feeling that Lincoln regarded the subject as far transcending the ambitions of the personal interests of the debaters. It was of little moment, he said, whether they voted him or Judge Douglas up or down, but it was tremendously important that the question should be decided rightly. His reputation may have suffered in the opinion of some, because he made them think so deeply upon what he said that they, for the moment, forgot him altogether, and yet, is this not the very perfection of speech? It is the purpose of the orator to persuade, and to do this he presents, not himself, but his subjects. Someone, in describing the difference between Demosthenes and Cicero, said that "When Cicero spoke, people said, 'How well Cicero speaks'; but when Demosthenes spoke, they said, 'Let us go against Philip.'" In proportion as one can forget himself and become wholly absorbed in the cause which he is presenting does he measure up to the requirements of oratory.

In addition to the two essentials, Lincoln possessed what may be called the secondary aids to oratory. He was a master of statement. Few have equalled him in the ability to strip a truth of surplus verbiage and present it in its naked strength. In the Declaration of Independence we read that there are certain self-evident truths, which are therein enumerated. If I were going to amend the proposition, I would say that all truth is self-evident. Not that any truth will be universally accepted, for not all are in a position or in an attitude to accept any given truth. In the interpretation of the parable of the sower, we are told that "the cares of this world and the deceitfulness of riches choke the truth," and it must be acknowledged that every truth has these or other difficulties to contend with. But a truth may be so clearly stated that it will commend itself to anyone who has not some special reason for rejecting it.

No one has more clearly stated the fundamental objections to slavery than Lincoln stated them, and he had a great advantage over his opponent in being able to state those objections frankly, for Judge Douglas neither denounced nor defended slavery as an institution—his plan embodied a compromise, and he could not discuss slavery upon its merits without alienating either the slave owner or the abolitionist.

Brevity is the soul of wit, and a part of Lincoln's reputation for wit lies in his ability to condense a great deal into a few words. He was epigrammatic. A molder of thought is not necessarily an originator of the thought molded. Just as lead molded into the form of bullets has its effectiveness increased, so thought may have its propagating power enormously increased by being molded into a form that the eye catches and the memory holds. Lincoln was the spokesman of his party —he gave felicitous expression to the thoughts of his followers.

His Gettysburg speech is not surpassed, if equalled, in beauty, simplicity, force and appropriateness by any speech of the same length of any language. It is the world's model of eloquence, elegance and condensation. He might safely rest his reputation as an orator on that speech alone.

He was apt in illustration—no one more so. A simple story or simile drawn from every-day life flashed before his hearers the argument that he wanted to present. He did not speak over the heads of his hearers, and yet his language was never commonplace. There is strength in simplicity, and Lincoln's style was simplicity itself.

He understood the power of the interrogatory, for some of his most powerful arguments were condensed into questions. Of all those who discussed the evils of separation and the advantages to be derived from the preservation of the Union, no one ever put the matter more forcibly than Lincoln did when, referring to the possibility of war and the certainty of peace some time, even if the Union was divided, he called attention to the fact that the same question would have to be dealt with, and then asked: "Can enemies make treaties easier than friends can make laws?"

He made frequent use of Bible language and of illustrations drawn from Holy Writ. It is said that when he was preparing his Springfield speech of 1858, he spent hours trying to find language that would express the idea that dominated his entire career—namely, that a republic could not permanently endure half free and half slave, and that finally a Bible passage flashed through his mind and he exclaimed: "I have found it! 'A house divided against itself cannot stand.'" And probably no other Bible passage ever exerted as much influence as this one in the settlement of a great controversy.

I have enumerated some, not all—but the more important—of his characteristics as an orator, and on this day I venture for the moment to turn the thoughts of this audience away from the great work that he accomplished as a patriot, away from his achievements in the line of statecraft, to the means employed by him to bring before the public the ideas which attracted attention to him. His power as a public speaker was the foundation of his success, and while it is obscured by the superstructure that was reared upon it, it cannot be entirely overlooked as the returning anniversary of his birth calls increasing attention to the widening influence of his work. With no military career to dazzle the eye or excite the imagination; with no public service to make his name familiar to the reading public, his elevation to the presidency would have been impossible without his oratory. The eloquence of Demosthenes and Cicero were no more necessary to their work, and Lincoln deserves to have his name written on the scroll with theirs.

From "Speeches of William Jennings Bryan," Funk & Wagnalls Company. By permission of the author and publishers.

THE VALUE OF ART TO THE PEOPLE

OTTO H. KAHN

Otto H. Kahn, capitalist and patron of art, was born in Manheim, Germany, the son of a naturalized American citizen. He was educated in Germany and England. Since 1897 he has been an active member of the banking firm of Kuhn, Loeb & Company; a director of large corporations, including the Equitable Trust Company and the Union Pacific Railroad Company; a trustee of the Massachusetts Institute of Technology, of Rutgers College, and of other educational institutions; and chairman of the Metropolitan Opera Company, of New York.

The address quoted here was given at the annual dinner of the American Federation of Arts held in Washington, May 16, 1924.

I HAVE been asked to make a few observations on the subject of "The Value of Art to the People."

In doing so, let me say at the outset that, when speaking of "the people," I use the term not with the somewhat patronizing inflection and in the rather limited sense sometimes imparted to it, but that I include in it the well-to-do, the successful, the learned, the distinguished, as well as "the butcher, the baker, the candlestick maker," and so forth.

It seems to me that, when speaking of the arts, we must not overlook the art of living. Walter Pater, in his great book, "The Renaissance," says: "We have an interval, and then our place knows us no more. . . . Our one chance lies in expanding that interval, in getting as many pulsations as possible into the given time." He urges an activity which "does yield you this fruit of a quickened, multiplied consciousness," and he puts foremost among the means available towards that end the cultivation of beauty and art.

Whether or not we share this viewpoint and appraisal, there can be no doubt that no life is quite complete, however worthy, useful and successful it may be, which does not include a responsiveness to the call of beauty and art, which has not known the thrill that comes from these things.

When the right to vote was first given to broad masses of the people in England, a great aristocrat said, "Now, we must educate our masters." He was right. He enunciated a theory which many years earlier had been adopted as basic in the conception of democracy in America.

But education that envisages merely the brain is a lopsided thing. To be complete, to fulfill its true purpose, it must not only envisage likewise the training of character, but it must also foster taste and seek to minister to that subtle, undefinable and multipotent thing which we call the soul.

The lives of the vast majority of the people are cast upon a background of sameness and routine. Perhaps that may be unavoidable. The world's daily work has got to be done. But all the more reason and needfulness for opening up, for making readily accessible and for cultivating, those pastures where beauty and inspiration may be gathered by all.

We all, rich and poor alike, need to give our souls an airing once in a while. We need to exercise the muscles of our inner selves just as we exercise those of our bodies. We must have outlets for our emotions. Qualities and impulses of the right kind, when given due scope, enhance the zest and happiness of our lives; when thwarted, starved or denied, they are apt to turn to poison within us.

Some of the unrest, the unruliness, the transgressions even, of the day, some of the seeking after sensations, some of the manifestations of extreme and subversive tendencies, arise in no small part, I believe, from an impulse of reaction against the humdrumness and lack of inspirational opportunity of everyday existence. Much can be done by art to give satisfaction to that natural and legitimate impulse and to lead it into fruitful channels instead of letting it run a misguided or even destructive course.

Art is not the plaything of opulence. It is a robust, red-blooded thing. It is true equality of opportunity. In a world too much given to accentuate the things which divide us, it is one of those fundamental elements which unite us and make us kin in common understanding, common feelings, common reactions. It is true democracy, knowing nothing of caste, class or rank. It may bestow its choicest gifts upon utter poverty; it may deny them entirely to great wealth.

Art is the truest League of Nations, speaking a language and preaching a message understood by all peoples. For ten years the world has been sadly out of gear. Governments, Parliaments, diplomats, politicians, have vainly tried to set it right. The devil's visitation which was let loose upon the world ten years ago, to the defeat and disaster of its perpetrators, and from the aftermath of which it has not yet been able to free itself, arose from an accursed aberration of the spirit. It can only be banished wholly by the power of the spirit, mobilized and marshalled for high and righteous aims. Among those fields where the rare and benign herbs grow, from which healing may be gathered for the ills of the world, one of the most fecund is that of art.

Art is a mighty element for civic progress. It leads us to seek and to appreciate that which is high, worthy and exalting, and to despise, and to turn away from, that which is vulgar, cheap and degrading.

It is no copy-book maxim, but sober truth to say that to have appreciation of, and understanding for, art is to have one of the most genuine and remunerative forms of wealth which it is given to mortal man to possess. I measure my words when I say that not the most profitable transaction of my business career has brought me results comparable in value and in lasting yield to those which I derived from the investment of hearing, in my early youth, let me say, "Tristan and Isolde," or seeing Botticelli's "Primavera." Moreover, the dividends which we receive from the appreciation of beauty and the cultivation of art are wholly "tax-exempt." No surtaxes can diminish them, no Bolshevik can take them away from us.

Art is a veritable "fountain of youth." The ancients had a saying, "Those whom the gods love, die young." I would interpret that saying to mean not that those favored by the gods die young in years, but that by the grace of the gods they remain young to their dying day, however long that be deferred. I venture to question whether there is any tonic as stimulating, any gland-transplantation as rejuvenating as is the quickening of the blood, the stirring up of the inner, deeper, self, which the powerful medicine of art can bring about. Those who love art and are truly susceptible to its spell, do die young in the sense that they remain young to their dying day.

Such observations as I have had opportunity to make—and the opportunities have been frequent and varied—have convinced me that there are many millions of the plain people whose souls are hungry, whose ears are open to the call of art, whose eyes light up at her approach, whose voices welcome her with enthusiastic gladness.

These observations have convinced me, too, that "you can trust the people" even in art. That does not mean that every horny-handed son of toil is, or can be made, an art connoisseur. It does not mean that the people, by and large, whatever their station, are *born* with good taste. On the contrary, the vast majority, whether of rich or poor parentage, are *born* with a natural tendency to respond rather to the garish, vivid and obvious than the mellow, restrained and æsthetic. It does mean that the masses of the American people are susceptible to the message of true art, that they are responsive to education and example in art, that they welcome and gladly follow leadership on the road to knowledge and discernment, and that once they have become imbued with correct standards of appreciation they adhere to them and apply them. As one conspicuous illustration of this, I need only point to the style of architecture which now prevails in America for buildings, public or private, large or small, down to the most modest, as compared to what it used to be a generation ago.

Much yet remains to be done for the popularization of art, the training of taste, and the providing of opportunity for artistic talent and ambition, but a great deal has been done of late years, and more and more is being done to excellent effect.

I believe, speaking generally, and with those reservations which are inherent in the enormous size of our country and the vastness of its population, it is not too much to say that the American standard of art appreciation has reached a point where it is either equal or superior to that prevailing among the peoples of Europe, with very few exceptions.

It may be mentioned in this connection as a circumstance significant of the past two decades on this soil, that the scoffer at art has gone completely out of fashion. He who would indulge in jeers and gibes at serious art movements, who would disparage and slight, let alone hinder or oppose, art, finds listeners or followers no longer in America. Art has overrun and captured the trenches which were held against her by incomprehension, indifference and prejudice, and, passing beyond, has firmly established herself in an unassailable position. She stands respected by all, revered by many.

It has been a source of wonderment to me, many a time, how frequently "the people" are underestimated by those who seek their votes or their patronage. Too many of our politicians seem to think that the people want and need to be coddled and flattered and "softsoaped," though experience has shown that the royal road to popular success is to demonstrate courage and independence and to stand up man-fashion for one's convictions. Similarly, while it is gratifying to record the great and auspicious progress of the American stage within the recent past, we still meet purveyors of theatrical wares who seem to think that they must play down to an assumed level of public shallowness and "tired business man" standards, although experience has shown that the greatest probability of scoring a hit is in aiming high.

The American Federation of Arts, with faith in the people and with understanding of the people, is pointing the way along the road which leads to the heights. It is calling the people to follow, and it is not calling in vain. A distinguished writer has said: "There is only one thing that can be taught: by wise teachers, by love, by example, by privation, by sorrow, by life, we can be taught to learn. Beyond that, although everything may be *learned,* hardly anything can be *taught.*" In the fine sense of these pregnant words, your Federation is indeed teaching the people to learn.

Shortly after victory had been won in the late war, Mr. Lloyd George made a speech in which, referring to the armies returning home, he pledged his aid to "make England a country fit for heroes to live in."

Far be it from me to fail in admiring and grateful recognition of the glorious heroism of those, Americans and others, with whose blood, willingly shed in a noble cause, victory was written upon the banners of America and her Allies. But there is another kind of heroism—less stirring, less impressive, not recorded in the book of fame, but no less real. It is that of the many millions of average men and women who, in meeting the tasks of the workaday world, practice the brave and simple philosophy of righteous living; who, uncheered by comrades, unstimulated by the ardor of battle, unrewarded by renown, contribute to the common cause daily acts of self-discipline and self-denial, of honor and of duty and of faith. It is one of the noblest achievements in the upward struggle of humanity through the ages,—this habitual, homely, ingrained heroism of the rank and file, of the "unknown soldier" of the battle of life.

To those people, the plain men and women of America, you are bringing true enrichment. You are enhancing the wages of their lives by aiding them to find and have access to the joys and inspirations, to the compensation and solace, which are derivable from art. The American Federation of Arts is performing with admirable public spirit and efficiency, a valuable service of twofold purport: It is bringing art to the people, and it is bringing the people to art.

By permission of the author.

THE LURE OF PARIS

S. PARKES CADMAN

Samuel Parkes Cadman is best known locally as pastor of the Central Congregational Church of Brooklyn, New York, and President of the Federated Council of Churches of Christ in America; also, as a trustee of Adelphi College, of the Brooklyn Institute of Arts and Sciences, and of other educational enterprises. But he is much more widely known, both abroad and here, as a platform and radio speaker who is eagerly sought and heard, and as an able writer.

WHO has not felt the pull or shared in the praise of the Fair City on the Seine! What a wealth of romance has been lavished on its history! What a history it has had! Indeed, what European city has made more history except Rome or London? Its very name works magically. Its heart beats pulsate through three continents. Its artistic fabrics are found in every continent. Its ideals sway the Latin race in France, Italy, Spain, Portugal and South America. From the time it was Lutetia, the primitive settlement of the tribe of the Parisii, to the present hour of this capital of polite civilization, its fascinations have seldom languished except beneath its self-inflicted terrors. Even these have had a magnetism all their own which makes the Revolution that ended the old regime in Europe a theme of perennial attraction. The Romans, Merovingians, Carlovingians, Capetians, ruled here, to be succeeded by the Houses of the Valois and the Bourbon, and later by the Napoleonic interlude. From the Island of La Cité millions of its sons have marched to the confines of the country, and into foreign lands within and beyond the narrow seas. At least twenty centuries have been made more significant in this place, during seven of which the theology of its doctors governed the Church, and the deeds of its statesmen and soldiers had much to do with the formation and growth of the State. The city itself has expanded in several overlappings until the fortifications of 300 years ago are now its famous boulevards. Upon La Cité Notre Dame is situated to soar upward as the Cathedral Church of the halfway hostelry of the Old World and the New. On the Hill of St. Genevieve, the patron saint of Paris, are the ruins of the Thermæ, the palace of Roman emperors, among whom were Constantine Chlorus, who built it, and Julian the Apostate, who referred in his letters to his "dear Lutetia." In its vicinity Gratian was defeated and slain by Maximus in A. D. 383.

From the vantage point of the Hill of the Saint the visitor surveys the metropolis in the river valley beneath. It stretches to Montmartre, crowned with its huge church, and beyond to where the horizon dips to the suburban landscape. That great group of Renaissance buildings on the far side of the Seine is the Louvre, one of the numerous former residences of royalty; now an incomparable treasure house for pictures, statuary and antiquities. To the left one glimpses the Sorbonne and the Pantheon, where the intellectual worth, fame and dignity of this great nation are enshrined in life and in death. To the northwest are the gardens of the Tuilleries, their spaciousness increased by the destruction of the palace which bore that name by the Communists who ravaged the city after the Franco-Prussian War of the last century. Immediately beneath the Hill are the oldest hospital in the world; the Towers and last relics of the ancient seat of the French kings, now the Courts of Justice, and the dainty San Chapelle. Leaving the Hill, as one saunters along the quays that line the left bank of the Seine, he can ransack the book stalls which are the delight of learned and simple. Here are the Luxembourg, the Académie, the Chamber of Deputies, and farther on, the Champ de Mars, the Hôtel des Invalides, and the Eiffel Tower. Crossing one of the numerous bridges that span the river, he may stand in the Place de la Concorde and think of the ghastly scenes of the Terror enacted there. To the west is the magnificent prospect governed by the

Arc de Triomphe. To the east is the Hôtel de Ville and the business section of the city. I sympathize with the suggestion that an American should enter it when dusk is falling, and the lights are low. The wide thoroughfares, arranged by the third Napoleon for the sweep of artillery fire as well as for their handsome trees, are thronged with purposeful people.

This is not France, and never was, as every Breton knows. But it is the most representative cross-section of France. The self-contained crowds, so alert, so outwardly gay, are lineal descendants of those citizens who made Paris the mistress of the country, and at intervals, the arbiter of Europe. They have an intensely logical disposition masked by the secret of a perpetual smile. Trials innumerable and of the severest sort have not extinguished their buoyancy. In them Latin vivacity and joy; its ineradicable persuasion that a merry heart goes all the way, survive tyranny and revolution. The workmen and shop girls sing as they hurry past; even the chauffeurs condescend to whistle. After London's solid gravity and massiveness, Paris is the revelation of another realm in which ethical propensities prove irrepressible.

The long, smooth journey across the marshes of Picardy or through the orchards of Normandy can be used to good effect by lovers of the past. It seems a quick transition from peasants laboring till dark, and miners homeward wending their weary way, to the splendidly illuminated capital of pleasure. Observers wonder how much of this pleasure is an artificial product, economized for profit. But there can be no question about its charm. Doubtless it has a pretentious side. So do the grimaces and asides of the actor who convulses his audience with laughter while his own thoughts are prosaic enough. Notwithstanding, there is a naturalness, an ordered sequence, a decisive habit, a picturesque clearness of mind and action in the native Parisian which must be apprehended by those who would understand him. The philosophy which enabled its foremost modern exponent, Anatole France, to adopt without demur his nation's name, receives here a universal application. As to whether it makes for steady progress and eventual security is entirely a different matter. I confess that I am skeptical about the lasting values of pleasure. This skepticism may be the result of an inbred Puritanism, and so it should be treated cautiously. Yet if the gayety of nations is enriched by Paris, the sobriety of English-speaking states has outdistanced that gayety in the making of nations. What once was done on the banks of the Seine was vital to the Americas, as they were then called. Today it is secondary in importance. The rule of half a hemisphere was forfeited to the misgovernment and dalliance of the court clique at Versailles. The noblest sons of France achieved marvels in Canada and in the valleys of the Ohio and the Mississippi. But they saw their heroical labors sacrificed to pomp and vanity. Montcalm's gallant but unsuccessful defense of Quebec marked the passing of France in the West. The sterner, less imaginative, less brilliant Saxon had conquered; the sacrificial outpourings of French blood and treasure had been betrayed. Yet this is not the complete story of Paris nor of France. The man or woman who is intrigued by the high and permanent life of the capital will be amply rewarded for his or her pains. It is the Paris of Charlemagne, of St. Louis, of Abelard, of Henry of Navarre, of Pascal, of Pasteur which has created some of the finest traditions of statecraft, religion and learning. I name these outstanding benefactors because they are typical of the Latin race at its best. To be sure, Charlemagne was a Teuton, but the rest, and also he, were deeply imbued with those characteristically Latin principles which endow the general welfare. Not then the City of Delights, forced or spontaneous, but the City of the University, of the Cathedral, of the Laboratories, of the Académie, should be kept steadfastly before us. It has no more relation to the pornographic side of Parisian life than has a New England meeting house to a lewd theater. While pleasure is never godless so long as it is safe, and must be accepted as a recreation, it is not real life. Its fires burn low to die; its bloom is like that of the poppy, soon shed. Let me commend the Paris whose lure is pure, whose bid for your grateful homage is untainted by the lusts of the flesh.

It does not cry nor strive, nor parade its precious wares on the boulevards, which often market very different commodities. Yet it has not wavered in its allegiances to freedom or to God. The boiling pot of diversified human experiments has frequently boiled over. The excessive cynicism of the philosophers has been complemented by the brutal outbreaks of the Terrorists. But the Gothic Churches, the University, the Schools, the Galleries filled with priceless paintings, the Parks and Pleasaunces are the soul of this amazing city. Vulgarians and sensualists who resort thither for riotous ends seldom, if ever, discern that soul. They are content to linger in sinks of iniquity and speak loudly of revels which France itself abhors. One speculates how they would endure a prolonged stay at Versailles. Perhaps the race has not seen, outside the Orient, a more grandiose setting of earthly pride and confidence than is given by that piece of faded magnificence. There the monarchy gained its apotheosis. There it drew to itself and absorbed whatever in France or in Europe seemed meritorious. The might of war, the culture of peace, the prodigious efforts of architects and landscape gardeners, the slave-like exertions of countless workmen were commandeered by absolutism for its personal aggrandizements. Yet as the worldling paces the deserted halls and avenues of this colossal and blood-sucking blunder, he feels, I venture to believe, the chill of its pronounced decay. If the "Grand Monarque" failed, if he bequeathed a fatal heritage, if his posterity was ruined by it, if these same halls where he shone resplendent, resounded later with the cry of vengeance, as they did, who can hope to make a material triumph permanent?

That great word of wisdom—"Love not the world nor the things of the world, for the world passeth away . . . but he that doeth the Will of God abideth forever"—should be inscribed on the great gateway of Versailles. Worse than the downfall of the Bourbon monarchy, was its assassination of faith and love and reverence in Frenchmen. They have always craved a strong government. For this reason they venerated authority, and flung unto royal or imperial hands the millions of their sons to do with them as they would. Consider what they have suffered before you blame them. The indifference, the haughtiness, the extravagance, the shiftiness, the corruption of the older regime! the ceaseless campaigns and consequent wastes and harryings of the Corsican! the fearful ills inflicted on France by the "Man of Sedan"! What a foul record; which no bedizenments of gunpowder and glory can conceal. Yet behind all, even in 1870, there was "France; always France!" as M. Thiers declared. And Paris led the march back to peace and power on the bitter road of disillusionment. She despatched the Second Empire to well deserved oblivion; she set up the pitiful young Republic.

Few expected it to survive Marshal McMahon's presidency. Was he not the stop-gap, the naïve crusader for "a moral order" which should precede the restoration of monarchy? But its claimants could not reconcile their differences, and some of them had not learned sense before they departed this life. The Bourbons are not a receptive family. The Bonapartes are merely a tarnished name. So the Republic has lived on to disappoint its foes and surprise its friends. It has often lived dangerously, but without tumbling headlong into the abyss. If politics has seldom given Paris or France equivalents for their laudable aspirations, religion is not to blame. Faith, whether Roman Catholic or Protestant, is sorely harassed by a predominant secularism in life and education. The simple witness of the McAll Mission to God, to Christ, to the Redemptive Evangel of the New Testament is as reprehensible to numerous leading Frenchmen as the historic witness of the Church which built the most beautiful of Gothic minsters, and trained the saints and heroes of a millennium. I conclude that what we need in this Republic is the prime necessity of her sister over seas—a revival of undefiled and regenerating religion. Frenchmen and Americans should get out of their speedy automobiles and take another, and a long, long look at the Cross. The France we love is blessed with a castellated domestic system. She always guards her homes against the Beast that stalks the Boulevards, or skulks in secret dens, or foams and howls in dirty literature, and in the pursuits of abnormal, animalized degeneracy. She has a resiliency which brought her through the fateful struggle of 1914 to 1918. She has a peculiarly incisive mentality which spurs the ineptitude of the non-Latin brain. She has an imperishable capacity for trust which ought to find more reputable objectives than monarchies, republics or socialistic schemes can supply. It is admittedly hazardous to define the Ideals of those who are not of your cult or tribe. But I cannot read the annals of Paris and yield to despair. She has risen too frequently, Phoenix-like, from her ashes. She lives in countless ways today. As her unbiased well-wisher, I but repeat the fervent sentiment of my countrymen that she may live on to be the Creative City of God's Beauty for all nations. To do this, she will first have to call to her aid a salvation which enlists all her genius in behalf of goodness and truth. In Christ is that salvation, goodness, truth and life which men of all cities must possess or perish.

From *The Brooklyn Eagle,* by permission of the author.

A GREAT EXAMPLE

THE RIGHT HONOURABLE VISCOUNT CECIL

Viscount Cecil of Chelwood voiced Great Britain's tribute of William Howard Taft in the following radio address brought to the United States from London by the Columbia Broadcasting System, March 11, 1930. The address was heard in the United States over a national network and was transmitted to all parts of the world over Columbia's short-wave station W2XE. Viscount Cecil spoke from 12:36 to 12:46 P. M. as the Taft funeral procession was passing down Pennsylvania Avenue in Washington, D.C.

I AM not going to try today to make any estimate of the value of Mr. Taft's services to his own country. Those far better qualified than myself have done or will do that. That he was a great statesman and a great judge, we all know, and we all know that he filled the highest offices open to a citizen of the United States and filled them with distinction. But, he did more than that. He gave to the world a great example. Here was a man whose every action was ruled by a sense of the duty he owed, first to his countrymen, and, second, to the world.

Many unjust things are said about the rising generation of today. In most ways they are at least as praiseworthy as their forerunners, but on one point perhaps some of them seem lacking. They do not fully recognize that they owe an obligation to their fellow creatures.

No one could have said that of William Howard Taft. Duty was his god. Such praise may seem austere. Nothing could be further from the truth. Indeed, the first thing that struck an acquaintance was his overflowing geniality. His welcome was alone enough to make one feel more satisfied with life. A man full of joy and honest laughter, at least so he seemed to those who came in contact with him, but none the less a stern critic of himself.

What, then, has he left behind him? He has left, in the first place, his mark on the history of his own country. He has left a standard of what men should be who occupy great positions. He has accomplished work of value in the various departments over which he presided, in the Philippines, in the White House, in the Supreme Court.

But, for one like myself, his great title to fame must always be his work for peace. He was one of the founders of that movement which had its greatest expression in the League of Nations. In some respects his organization, the League to Enforce Peace, laid down a doctrine in advance of that enshrined in the Covenant of the League of Nations. He wanted to see compulsory arbitration in all international disputes which the Covenant only recommended as desirable. Indeed, it is only now that the nations of the world, and not all of them, are coming to accept beforehand the jurisdiction of a court of law in all justiciable disputes.

Perhaps he showed his greatness most in the fact that, though he was not asked to co-operate in the drafting of the Covenant, though in some respects, as I have said, it did not go so far as he desired, though it was the work of one who was politically opposed to him, he nevertheless wholeheartedly supported it because he believed it made for peace. He believed with all the conviction of a great soul in the need for good will amongst the nations, and he allowed no lesser considerations to prevent him from advocating whatever means appeared to be available at the moment to secure that great end.

Most of all, he desired the friendship of the two English-speaking peoples. That was natural, for he was a great lawyer. It isn't sufficiently recognized that a great bond of union between us is our system of jurisprudence. It is quite true that in many details the laws of the two countries differ, but the general principles are the same. We read and cite in our courts the decisions of your judges, and I believe you do the same with regard to ours. The names of such men as Marshall and Storey are as widely reverenced in England as they are in America. No better book on the common law has been written in either country than that by Mr. Justice Holmes.

When English and American lawyers meet, they talk the same language, both linguistically and juridically. Of this, Mr. Taft was fully conscious.

When he was studying for the law, he came over here to see how it was practiced in England, and when, as Chief Justice, he desired to improve in some respects the procedure of the Supreme Court, it was natural for him to visit us to see how similar problems had been dealt with in this country. And when he came, he found a deep appreciation of himself as a representative of a great, kindred legal system, as deep as his appreciation of our law.

It is good for us here to remember that we over here tried our best to do him honor and reverence when he came amongst us for the last time as Chief Justice.

But though he deeply desired Anglo-American friendship, that was only part of a great whole. He recognized that peace was the condition of all progress and that without it all that makes men differ from peace is in danger of atrophy and destruction. He recognized further that peace was one whole and whenever it is broken the injury is world-wide, not only because the bonds of commerce and finance have drawn us all far closer together than in earlier times, but also, and perhaps chiefly, because science and art and literature and religion have no boundaries.

What is learned or achieved in one part of the world in these matters inures for the benefit of the whole. A scientific discovery in South America may modify the whole of the social life of Asia, and a great work of art or literature in the United States is studied as eagerly in Europe as in the country which gave it birth.

This has always been true in a degree, but with the perfecting of means of transportation and communication it is becoming daily and almost hourly more true.

A hundred years ago the English Channel was almost as great a physical obstacle as the Atlantic is today, and in all human probability in another century the Atlantic will have shrunk to the dimensions of one of the Great Lakes, provided, of course, no future war shatters our civilization.

And so for this and similar reasons Mr. Taft worked for world peace, setting all other considerations aside and caring only to do what he could to exterminate the demon of war. Surely he must have felt, before he died, great encouragement. The seed which he and others planted has grown with astonishing rapidity. You have only to take up a book of political memoirs of twenty years ago to see how far in that time we have traveled.

No doubt there is much more to do. If Mr. Taft's work is to be secure we have got to shed many prejudices and be prepared to make many sacrifices before the work to which he was devoted shall be safely established in the world. It is good to think how cheered he must have been by recent events and how warmly he must have rejoiced in his heart over the course which they have taken. That is, indeed, the picture of him which remains to those of us who met him in his life—a man single minded in pursuit of what he thought right, tolerant to others, rejoicing in his strength and his courage, determined to work for his fellowmen, and, above all, to do his duty. We mourn his loss.

By permission of the New York *Herald Tribune.*

GET FACTS; LOOK FAR; THINK THROUGH

WILLIAM C. REDFIELD

William C. Redfield, an authority on foreign and domestic commerce and industrial conditions, was Secretary of Commerce in the cabinet of President Wilson. He had been Commissioner of Public Works for the Borough of Brooklyn, New York, 1902–'3; and a member of the Sixty-second Congress. He is now president of the National Institute of Social Sciences; president of the Danish-American Corporation, and associated with Redmond & Company, New York, since January 1, 1927. He was formerly president of the American Manufacturers' Export Association, the National Society for the Promotion of Industrial Education, and a director of the Brooklyn Chamber of Commerce. Mr. Redfield was born in Albany, New York, in 1858.

Mr. Redfield is a masterful speaker. This address was delivered at Boston University, September 25, 1916, before the student assembly of the College of Business Administration, and Mr. Redfield finds it still, as he says, "up-to-date."

I HAVE been cudgeling what serves me for a brain in an effort to find something to say to you that would "stick." Of course it must be worth sticking or it will not stick, and therein lies the difficulty. One does not wish to place before you a series of bromidiums, nor to repeat that which instructors will tell you far better in the coming weeks.

Casting about, therefore, for something real, and looking back for that purpose over a long business life, two or three brief phrases have occurred to me, which as they are looked at from different angles seem to present principles so clear, so sound, so proven, as to be worth stating. Let us take then the subject for this evening's talk the following terse business maxims:

Get facts; look far; think through.

In these six words lie packed masses of worldly and of spiritual wisdom. They are easy words to say, but the processes they represent are most difficult to do. They involve abandonment of mental habits, the forsaking of preconceived ideas, the non-acceptance of many current doctrines, the assertion of individuality, the restraint from hasty conclusions, the formation of unwonted habits; they call for effort, training, and long practice.

I think it is true no man has ever succeeded largely in the business world without having all three of these principles present in his work to some degree. On the other hand, the presence of one or another of them without the rest often works serious damage. For these principles are full of power, and power that is uncontrolled works harm.

For one to get facts may make him but a grubber into old tomes, if he does naught else. For one to look far may mean to become a visionary, if that be all he does. For one to think through may make him a dreamer in an active world or lead to indecision. The facts must be used with the thorough thought and the far outlook if the balance of mental power in business life is to be fruitful. Let us, then, look briefly at these three principles to see something of what they involve.

First, then, get facts. If we apply this principle as a measure to the business world we shall soon see that the men who live up to this principle are relatively few and lonely, and that most of us deal to a greater or less extent with fancies or with fallacies which we hope or believe are facts. Few of us will go as far in practice as the man who said to me, "If I don't know why I know what I think I know, then I want to know." Most of us are content with assumptions and few follow the scriptural maxim to prove all things and to hold fast that which is good. Yet facts, as has been well said, are stubborn things, and you may make up your mind now that if during your business lives you do not get the facts, the facts will get you.

It is not always easy to get the facts. On the contrary, it is commonly hard to get them, and because it is hard we are apt to accept assertions as to the facts from those whom we think ought to know instead of exerting ourselves to learn them directly. A business man feels, for example, that his competitor uses unworthy practices and is tempted himself to follow the bad example lest in competition he be outdone. He does not certainly know his competitor does these things. He is told it and believes it because perhaps he can not otherwise explain some success that competitor has won. It is commonly a mistake, and if he sought patiently for the facts he would often find them and save him from an error of judgment respecting another and from business mistakes upon his own part.

Another man—many a man—thinks he knows what it costs him to do business. He does not know that he knows. He merely thinks he does. He gets along, perhaps for years, without actually learning the truth about the cost of his own business. You will say that self-interest, common sense, and other equally strong motives would make him learn the truth. I agree they ought to do so, but the fact is they do not. The Chairman of the Federal Trade Commission says half the business concerns do not know what it costs them to do business, and the experience of the accountants of my own department justify the statement. I once worked as bookkeeper for a man who would not allow a trial balance to be taken. Although for my own protection, under the advice of wiser men, I took this trial balance privately, he never knew, or inquired, what the full facts were respecting his own business. I was accountant for a man who after thirty years' experience sold for $8,000 an apparatus which, including overhead, cost him $9,000 to produce, and he was angry when a younger man than he suggested the facts to him. A friend was employed to examine into the operations of an industry only to find the methods of the management were bad; but that management strenuously objected to being told so. One must not go so far as to forget that there are in the business world thousands of men accurate and careful in the matters we are discussing, but there are more of the other kind, and some of them sit in high places.

Again there are the men who want all facts which concur with their preconceived opinions and who resent facts which do not so agree. Such concerns have little use for the cold and searching light of science, to which all truth is of equal value. They are content with a portion of the facts and object to being shaken out of the rut in which they run.

Furthermore the business world is full of facts which fight. There are moral facts which oppose immoral facts; honest facts which hate dishonest facts; partial facts which hate whole facts; crooked facts which abhor the straight ones. Yet the stern teaching of experience is that the crooked and the dishonest facts when the light is thrown on them prove not to be facts at all but only pseudo facts, having the appearance but not the reality.

To get facts, then, is fundamental. With them you stand on solid ground. Without them, or with them but partially, your footing is uncertain. You must have a docile mind, however, if you are to follow this rule, a mind open to truth, even to unpleasant truth, even to truth which sets awry that which you have believed and been taught. Yet the strong man sets his mind four-square to the truth and abhors that particularly villainous form of falsehood which tells but half of it.

First and foremost, then, as a mental quality and as a business practice, let me urge upon you this simple yet complex duty, Get facts.

Do not be afraid of them, for they have no fear of you. If you have them with you, you are safe. Without them you are always in danger. Know your job. Don't merely think you know it. There is always place in the world for the man that knows and who knows that he knows.

This done you have well begun. Candidly, you will probably spend a lifetime in the doing of it and meanwhile have other serious work to do.

Next I have set the principle "Look far." Let no pent-up Utica confine your powers. The way in which you treat this second principle will show if you are large or little men. A little man may get facts, but he can not use them largely for he is too small himself. A blind man might have certain facts at hand of which he knew, but he could not use them well since he is blind. In the mental world there are relative shades of blindness. There is a great deal of near-sight, a very large mass of ordinary sight; but the men of far mental sight, those who are called men of light and leading, are few and far between. Yet on your ability to see far depends your power to use the facts you get. You may, for example, some day run a factory and be concerned with paying wages. You may, if you do not look far, even speak of the men you employ as "hands." There are plenty of short-sighted men who call them so. If you look far, however, you will see that it would be wiser to think of them as minds, or even as souls. For men do not work with hands alone but with heart and brain. You can never lead hands; but you may, if you have facts and look afar, come to lead men. If you look far you will never describe human beings in terms of arithmetic, for you will see that the arithmetic is dead and that the men are living. You will not, if you look far, think there is such a thing as a day's work, for there is no such thing and will be none until all men work alike everywhere. There are as many kinds of day's work as there are kinds of men, but men are infinitely variable. If you look far you will not think that a fixed rate of pay produces a fixed result, for you will know that men are unlike and that what one can do another can not, and that what a second will do a third will not. You will see that in dealing with men you are dealing with character and temperament and health and heredity and a mass of other things that make up the complex being we call "man," and which sometimes in our nearsightedness we describe as a two-dollar man or a three-dollar man.

If you look far you will see beyond a whole mass of current phrases and ideas which are the outward and visible expression of the average mind but across which he who looks far sees clearly a more distant and more fruitful horizon. Nay, the very act of looking far will make facts precious to you, for the broad vision will bring them to your sight and make you value them.

There are all sorts of phrases which describe nearsight but which farsight over-rules. Nearsight says, Charity begins at home. Farsight adds, But does not end there. Nearsight would say, A bird in the hand is worth two in the bush. Farsight would say, What kind are in the bush and can I get them? Nearsight would say, Thus I have been taught. Farsight would say, Is this teaching true? Nearsight would have you live in a parish and be a parochial business man. Farsight would have you live in the world and draw upon the richness of it all for the enlarging of your life. It is one of the great phrases of the Old Book, and an inspiring one, which says, "Thou hast taken me and thou hast set me in a large place."

Having acquired the habit of getting facts and having caught the vision of things from afar, make your thinking straight. How many men there are in the business world who think in circles or at best in curves; whose minds lack the penetrating power which goes to the heart of things. If you have gotten facts and have the farsight, use the latter on the former to make all things mentally clear. If you do not think clearly you can not talk clearly. Good salesmanship is not a product of mental indigestion. Do you want to be able to state the facts of business to men of business, then you must think through those facts so that they are wholly controlled by you, so that they have become a part of your mental self, so that you will not stumble over your own mental obstructions in the very act of stating your case. A business problem will arise before you. First get the facts about it and treat them in a broad way, not in a narrow way. Do not stick them in a groove in which you like to run because it is easy and attempt to push them ahead of you in that same old line. Get them all and spread them on your mental table; get their bearings and adjust them in their actual relations, so that you may know how they lock and interlock. In this process you are thinking through those facts, and if you continue it to the end you will control the use of those facts. Again and again one sees in life men who mean well, who are willing to get the truth and willing to use it broadly, who do neither effectively because they have not thought the thing through. This thorough thinking is one of the finest safeguards a man can have against error, because as he sits down with his facts and chews the cud upon them over and over again they fall into relations, the false separates itself from the truth, the trifling from the essential, the strong from the weak, and by a process of mental discarding the useless are set aside and true values come to light.

Again and again I have found men in business problems who had thought pretty well but not thoroughly upon the thing in hand. Many times also I have met men who were masters of the thing with which they dealt. Thorough thinking would remove many a phantom which, though a ghost, still exerts power upon our thought. Thorough thinking will destroy many a false ideal. Slavery could not endure thinking through that subject. The dueling practice, with its false sense of honor, could not endure thorough thinking upon the subject. Many a business and political fallacy will die an early death to him who thinks it through. Many a teacher, I fear, may be embarrassed to have his pupils do thorough thinking, but it will do both the teacher and the pupil good to have this so. The process is not one which lends itself to smartness. To think through a thing is not always a quick process. There are men with minds like light, which seem to penetrate into the recesses of a subject. One of slower mental habit need not worry. He may in the end go deeper and stand on firmer ground. Quick comprehension is a most desirable business quality to be sought and valued, but it is not the same thing as thorough thinking and it does not take its place.

Finally, permit me a few words on the ideals of business. The business life will, if you treat it fairly, call forth your best. It will mean the search for truth. It will mean a broad and human philosophy. It will mean keen, incisive thought. All these are good. But your business is not to be your life. It is the means whereby you live, but your life is something else. To be absorbed in business so that you live for it is to be intellectually and spiritually maimed. One who does so is not a whole man but only part of what might be a complete man. Of course to gain has wonderful interest. It is fascinating to pit mind against mind, knowledge and acumen and reflection and energy against the similar powers in other men. It is a splendid and in the best form an ennobling part of life, but it is only a part. There is a certain shallow criticism among us, which does not get the facts and does not see far and does not think through, which would teach at times that business is sordid and its motto "An eye for an eye and a tooth for a tooth." Yet this city and others are full of the works of men who, after they have won in the business arena, have given their ideals play in enriching the towns which gave them birth or in which they live. Every such gift is a protest against the shallow cry that business is wholly sordid. Yet in saying this I have not given you even a glimpse of all the facts about it. There are today factories all over this land, thank God, in which men think through the problems of business with a far vision of the facts and who have grasped the ideal of service to and through those whom they employ and are holding up before them and to the world examples of leadership that make the business life stand on a level with all that is best in statesmanship and art and music and the law and the ministry and the other great and beautiful productive professions.

It is true of course, it is a part of the facts, that there are those—many of them—in business who only seek to get and who never think to give either of themselves or of that which they possess. So there are weak, wicked men in other high professions, men that prostitute art and medicine and perhaps the pulpit; who separate themselves from the great facts of life and with narrow vision think only on the surface of their own petty and selfish desires. Still, if the mills of the gods grind slowly they grind exceeding small. If we watch the facts of the growth of public thought and the increase of broad vision and of the habit of thorough thinking we shall see, if we look far enough, that these things are doomed; that selfishness is taken at its true lack of value; that littleness is known to be a small thing; that wealth without vision or ideals is power misplaced and is sternly judged as such. So we may hope that as the love of truth and obedience to it shall grow and as with firmer footing thereon we look afar and think clearly on what we see, we shall see our beloved America advancing to that primacy among the nations which awaits the nation which honors the facts, which looks afar, and which thinks clearly.

By permission of the author.

SPEECHES CELEBRATING THE EIGHTIETH BIRTHDAY OF THE HONORABLE ELIHU ROOT

SPEECH OF INTRODUCTION

CHARLES EVANS HUGHES

The dinner at which the Honorable Charles Evans Hughes[1] delivered this speech was held at the Union League Club of the City of New York, February 13, 1925.

WE are here to enjoy the highest privilege that this choice fellowship, with the pleasant memories of sixty years, can offer. We give our greeting to one who is of the very fibre of this Club, who has directed its activities, has re-enforced its patriotic purposes, and has endowed it in perpetuity with his example. Whatever may be the reluctance of the "abstemious Muse" to "weave a crown for living brows," we have no such hesitation. We owe it to ourselves to pay this tribute, and it is in accord with our happiest tradition. Here the garlands of esteem and affection have been placed upon the living brows of Evarts, of Choate, of Porter, of Depew, to mention a few of those we have delighted to honor, and in our hall of illustrious men, who hold the only patent of nobility in this Republic, that of worth of character, distinction of attainment, and pre-eminence in service, no one has higher place than our guide, philosopher and friend, Elihu Root.

This is the nearest approach that we can make in this country to the gift of an earldom. How fortunate of all men are those rare heroes of life, who emerge from the long strife untouched, who survive animosity and attack, who have risen above the possibility of detraction, and possessing vigor of body and mind and secure in the recognition of their achievements, obtain the reward of their unstinted labors in the serenity of age blessed with the most agreeable retrospect. "It is pleasant," said Socrates, "to grow old with good health and a good friend." But it is best to grow old, not only with health and friends, but with memories of the worthiest actions. We greet one tonight who has all the blessings that age can win and hold.

---

[1] See page 140 for biographical note.

And yet I find it difficult to speak of age in his presence. When I first saw him—nearly forty-two years ago—I was a student in the office of the United States District Attorney in this city, and I brought up the end of the procession of retainers who paid their respects to the new incumbent. He had been described to me as one who was certain to be the leader of the Bar and I looked upon him with the admiration of a young hero-worshipper. The impression was too deep ever to be effaced. How little that figure of litheness and vigor, of alertness and erect carriage, has changed! We pay our tribute not to age but to immortal youth.

I should like to say something of Mr. Root's career at the Bar, but that subject, I am advised, has been reserved for another. It is my part to express our sense of obligation, so far as I can do so in these brief remarks, to Root, the statesman. Yet it would be impossible to speak of him in that sphere without referring to his attainments as a lawyer. There are lawyers who bind their minds with the technicalities of their profession, tying up their activities with red tape. There are other lawyers who are fascinated with legal researches and become so burdened with their accumulations of learning that they are too heavily weighted for the civic struggle. But there are a few, unsurpassed in technical skill, without abating the zeal of their pursuit of knowledge, who ever show the mastery of a mind whose training and information are instruments and not fetters—the fitting instruments for the service of statesmanship which requires discipline as well as vision. Among those few, with a genius for statecraft as distinct as that of the most eminent painter, sculptor or poet for his art, stands Elihu Root.

Great crises demand great men, and it is equally true that exceptional talent waits on exceptional opportunity. The career we contemplate tonight is one of extraordinary opportunity adequately met, with constant revelation of new reservoirs of power. So varied and extensive have been the achievements of that career that it is impossible on this occasion even to mention all the high points and I must be content in merely indicating a few of them. We should not permit our attention to be so exclusively directed to the distinction attained in a broader field as to overlook Mr. Root's service to his native State. He has been a great citizen, the mentor of this commonwealth. It was natural, in view of his prominence at the Bar, that he should have been made chairman of the Judiciary Committee in the Constitutional Convention of 1894. There he supplied the leadership and skill needed to reconstruct our judicial organization and to distribute the appellate jurisdiction of our courts so as to provide improved opportunity for all necessary appeals, while limiting our highest court, except where the judgment is of death, to the review of questions of law. Said Mr. Choate, the President of that Convention, "if you look over the whole history of legislative bodies since their work was done by committees, it would be impossible to find a more masterly piece of work than this has been." In the Constitutional Convention of 1915, Mr. Root presided, and while the revised constitution then prepared failed of adoption by the people, the systematic reforms it proposed will be sure to guide future efforts in perfecting state administration, and the spirit of the work of the Convention marks it with lasting distinction. Mr. Root's intellectuality has led many to mistake his quality. They know little of his volcanic fire. In truth, I think I may say that his is the unquenchable zeal of the reformer held in control by a supreme practical judgment. In the Constitutional Convention of 1915 he flamed forth like a prophet of Israel, and so long as the political history of New York continues to be of interest, his speech to the Convention on invisible government in this State will be regarded as the most intimate, vivid and powerful description of the system which has mocked our boast of representative institutions. Said he: "We talk about the government of the Constitution. We have spent many days in discussing the powers of this and that and the other officers. What is the government of this State? What has it been during the forty years of my acquaintance with it? The government of the Constitution? Oh no! Not half the time, or halfway. . . . The invisible government proceeds to build up and maintain its power by reversal of the fundamental principle of good government, which is that men should be selected to perform the duties of the office; and to substitute the idea that men should be appointed to office for the preservation and enhancement and power of the political leader. . . . I assert that this perversion of democracy, this robbing democracy of virility, can be changed. . . . We cannot change it in a moment, but we can do our share. . . . While millions of men are fighting and dying for their countries across the ocean, . . . it is our inestimable privilege to do something here in moving our beloved State along the pathway towards better and purer government, a more pervasive morality and a more effective exercise of the powers of government which preserve the liberty of the people." That was the eloquent expression of Mr. Root's life purpose.

It was under the presidency of McKinley that Mr. Root was called to the service of the Nation as Secretary of War. When he was asked to take the place he said: "Thank the President for me, but say that it is quite absurd. I know nothing about war. I know nothing about the army." But President McKinley said that he was not looking for anyone who knew about war or about the army, but that he had to have a lawyer to direct the government of the Spanish islands which had come into our possession and that Mr. Root was the lawyer he wanted. And Mr. Root found but one answer to that, and so, as he said, "he went to perform a lawyer's duty for the greatest of all our clients, the Government of our Country"! In his service to his country he has been true to the highest ideal of his profession and there could be no higher praise than that. Even on the military side, he was able to make a great advance in perfecting military organization. But, in the larger sphere, he had, as he has told us, the work of applying to some ten millions of people in Cuba, Porto Rico and the Philippines the principles of American liberty. You will find in his instructions to the military Governor of Cuba in February, 1901, the formulation of our relations to Cuba which were afterwards embodied in what is called the Platt Amendment. You will find in his reports the explication of the principles to be applied in Porto Rico and the Philippines and the foundations of whatever successful administration we have in these islands. "It is our unquestioned duty," said he, "to make the interests of the people over whom we assert sovereignty the first and controlling consideration in all legislation and administration which concerns them, and to give them to the greatest possible extent individual freedom, self-government in accordance with their capacity, just and equal laws, and opportunity for education, for profitable industry, and for development in civilization."

Mr. Root has one of those rare equipments which would make him pre-eminent in any office, executive, legislative or judicial. He would have made a great president, a Chief Justice of highest distinction, as he was a conspicuously able administrator. In the Senate, by the dignity, worth and eloquence of his utterances, he recalled its most illustrious days.

It is, however, in the international sphere, that he has rendered the most notable service. He became Secretary of State under President Roosevelt. It is no disparagement of that dynamic personality to say that Roosevelt needed Root. Roosevelt admired and trusted Root, and Root admired and admonished Roosevelt. The American people were happy in that combination, that coefficiency in leadership. I should not dare in this brief tribute to attempt to review the international services of Mr. Root. Witness his memorable visit to South America and his enunciation there of the principles which must ever guide us in our relations to the Latin American republics. Witness his adjustment of the controversy with Japan through the disposition of the school question and the Root-Takahira exchanges called the Gentlemen's Agreement with respect to the immigration of laborers. Witness Mr. Root's instructions to our delegates to the Second Peace Conference at The Hague, setting forth the importance of adequate provision through a permanent tribunal for the judicial settlement of international controversy. Witness the needed reform in establishing our consular service upon a merit basis.

But Mr. Root has rendered even greater service in the international field since his retirement from office. As was said by the Nobel Committee in awarding to him the Nobel Peace Prize in 1913: "Since his retirement, Mr. Root has been recognized as the leader of the peace movement in the United States." I read in a work of one of our leading historical writers that when Mr. Root left office he "set up as a sage." I do not care for the form of the expression, but it embodies the truth. Mr. Root did not "set up" as a sage; he *was* a sage equipped with official experience and relieved of official burdens. Year after year he made his illuminating addresses as President of the American Society of International Law, addresses which form what may be considered our best contribution to the general literature on international relations. Long identified with the promotion of international arbitration Mr. Root served with distinction as a member of the Alaskan Boundary Tribunal of 1903, and as counsel for the United States in the North Atlantic Fisheries Arbitration in 1910. He has been a member of the Permanent Court of Arbitration at The Hague, and President of The Hague Tribunal of Arbitration between Great Britain, France, Spain and Portugal concerning church property. Mr. Root was at the head of the Special Diplomatic Mission to Russia in 1917 and he performed invaluable service as one of the American delegation to the Washington Conference on Limitation of Armament.

If you asked me what I considered to be the crown of his endeavor, I should say it was his skill in cutting through the entanglements which stood in the way of the establishment of a permanent court of international justice. His suggestion as to the method of selecting judges made that court possible, and this successful endeavor in the interest of international peace through promoting the reign of law will ever enshrine his memory.

The distinctive characteristic of Mr. Root's career has been his building solidly upon principle. Whether in state, national or international constructive efforts, he always goes down to bedrock. His work has not been sensational in method; he has never been moved by unworthy motives or sought a transient popularity at the expense of principle. Hence his work is permanent. He has told us that the secret of the success of the democratic experience must be found in self-restraint and that virtue he has always exemplified. His is the restraint not of excessive caution but of power under control and well directed. In the illustrations of that power, in the variety of that service, in the strength of his intellect, in his sustained effort, in his moral force, in his devotion to the cause of peace, he has exalted the American name.

He represents not merely her skill, or her best training, but the wisdom of America. This is the old lesson ever to be emphasized:

> "Wisdom is the principal thing; therefore get wisdom;
> Yea, with all thy getting, get understanding.
> Exalt her, and she will promote thee;
> She will bring thee to honor, when thou dost embrace her.
> She will give to thy head a chaplet of grace;
> A crown of beauty will she deliver to thee."

By permission of the author.

SPEECH OF RESPONSE

ELIHU ROOT

[After Mr. Hughes's vivid address, a biographical note on Mr. Root is superfluous; but the following slightly summarizes and supplements the data given.]

Elihu Root, one of the ablest and most eminent of contemporary statesmen, is a lawyer who was Secretary of War in the cabinet of President McKinley (1899–1904), Secretary of State under President Roosevelt (1905–'9), United States Senator from New York (1909–'15), and who is known to every continent for his services in the cause of international justice. The climax of his achievements was his work in 1920 as a member of the Commission of International Jurists, which, on invitation of the Council of the League of Nations, reported the plan for the new Permanent Court of International Justice (established 1921).

Mr. Root was awarded the Nobel Peace Prize for 1912; has been decorated by the kings of Greece and Belgium; has received the honorary LL.D. of most of our larger universities, the D.C.L. of Oxford, and degrees and honors from other foreign universities including those of Leyden, Toronto, Paris, Buenos Aires, and Lima, Peru. He is a graduate and a trustee of Hamilton College at Clinton, New York (Mr. Root was born at Clinton, 1845), and an LL.B. of New York University.

Among his published works are *Addresses on International Subjects*, *Addresses on Government and Citizenship*, *Miscellaneous Addresses;* also a number of books on the government and the foreign relations of the United States.

MR. PRESIDENT, FRIENDS AND FELLOWS OF THE UNION LEAGUE CLUB:—It is very hard for me to speak after what has been said. If I were to try to describe my own life I should say that I have done what came to my hand to do, as well as I could.

I would not be thought to take all the wonderful and gracious things that have been said about me too seriously. They affect me deeply. This gathering of my old friends in the Club affects me deeply. Everything said has been most grateful to me, because it is the assurance of friendship. That is the great thing. That is the great solace of age—friends and the memories of friends—and those memories gather about me here. I was a boy when I came into the Club, twenty-three years of age. For the ten years between 1868 and 1878, when I was married, this was my home. Before me now rise the faces of a great multitude of the finest and noblest youths possible to conceive. They have all passed, but the Club goes on. I wish to make acknowledgment of the influence upon my own life of my coming during the formative period of life into an institution which was dedicated to the public service. No institution can get away from the spirit of its origin. Miraculous cures are wrought by change of climate. The air we breathe determines the courses and the vigor of life. In the moral life the air we breathe is the great determinant. And, to become a part of an institution which had its origin in the fervor of great trial, and the banding together of men who loved their country and who sought to serve her; to come into the atmosphere which such an institution has and must always have is a great thing for a boy; and it is a great thing for a city, however great it may be, and a great thing for a country, to have institutions which have their origin in that spirit.

This Club does not study questions of government scientifically, as many organizations do in these days; it is not a club of critics, it is a club of actors in life—and the difference between the two is very great. The observer in the attitude of a critic differs widely from an actor in the attitude of strong desire to accomplish purposes. This institution is an institution composed of actors, not theorists, not students, not scientific enquirers, but men engaged in the work of life, in the attitude of the doer rather than the critic, binding themselves together for the more efficient doing of the things that are necessary to accomplish the great purposes of our country, of our free government.

I am very grateful to the distinguished friends who have come here tonight upon your invitation to add their words of friendship to the honor which you pay me. I cannot reply to them in detail. I cannot say what I think of what they have said, I can only express my deep gratitude to Mr. Hughes and to Mr. Beck and to your president for their words, and still more for the feeling in their hearts which made it possible for them to say what they have said.

I think that I would like to say a few words to you all about the view that I take of the progress of our country during this long period. Special incidents are not of so much consequence. This man does this, another does that, duties may be well done, special services may be rendered, misguided men may attack the foundations of government, wild enthusiasts may seek to disturb and destroy the order of our social life. Important events may happen for good or for ill. They all pass, and as we look back at them, they all seek a level; but the important thing, the all-important thing is the tendency. In what direction have we been going? Not whether the country was right or wrong on this question or that question, not so much whether our legislative bodies are doing their work as they ought to now, not so much whether our laws are being executed as well as they ought to be, but which way is the country going? What is the aggregate and permanent effect upon the maintenance and the development and the progress of free self-government, for the maintenance of liberty and justice? Are we going up or down? Is the experiment gaining ground, or is it losing? Have all the services and all the sacrifices and all the good and brave things done been built into a structure that will last, or have they been wasted?

Now, let me give you an old man's view about what has been happening in these fifty-seven years since I came into this Club, when John Jay was president of it, years during which the whole list of the resident members of the Club has changed. There are but two men living who were on the list in 1868, and there are but three men living who came into the Club in that year. The two are Charles Lanier and Horace W. Fuller, and the three who came in and still live are Chauncey M. Depew, George F. Baker and myself.

George Baker and Depew float upon golden clouds. They have ceased to reckon the years of their lives by ordinary measurements, and they count their ages by light years. I am here to tell you what I think.

With all the things I see that seem to be going wrong, with all the deficiencies that trouble me nights when I do not get to sleep as soon as I ought, with all the wrong steps that I see taken, about Japan and otherwise, nevertheless I see this, that there is a far greater interest in public affairs among the people of the United States than there was fifty-seven years ago. Where you could find one man then who was interested in the administration of our government and the proper regulation of our social order, you find a thousand today. There is a far better understanding among the people of the United States of what is essential to the performance of the duty of citizenship than there was then. All over the country there is vast inquiry, studious investigation, real study, real thought, really anxious seeking after light as to the duty of citizenship.

We have more honest elections—the very root of the working of the institutions of free government—far more honest elections than we had. It was my duty forty years ago in the District Attorney's office to enforce the election laws of the United States. Matters which were of common happening then would be unthinkable now. The processes through which the freeman's will expressed in the ballot receives effect have become a part of the ordinary habit, a recognized conformity to proper standards of conduct. I have seen men from a lodging house in this town with ballots put in their hands marched in single file up to the polling places under supervision to see that the ballots, which they were required to keep always in sight, were the ones that were put into the ballot box, in order that it might be certain that they had carried out their contract before they received their compensation. All the frauds and the intimidations and the violations of the rights of the voters which were common then have practically disappeared. You are to argue back from that to the greater competency and the more effective purpose of the plain people of the country for the orderly conduct of government.

There is far greater honesty in public service than there was half a century ago. The Credit Mobilier would be impossible now. More uproar has been raised by a single dereliction in high public office within the past year than was raised over the Credit Mobilier scandals, which embraced a large part of the people concerned in our government.

The excesses and frauds of the Tweed ring would be impossible today. The successors of those distinguished administrators are careful, because a more alert and competent people would not stand what they submitted to half a century ago. The Legislature of New York could not now indulge in the carnival of crime and favoritism and corruption which we then endured. Now, in the Congress of the United States, if any man be suspected of crookedness, or graft, he is a marked man. In state government, in city government, in the national government we are far more honest and upright and faithful than we were then.

We have become a more tolerant people towards the opinions of others. The Ku Klux Klan is a protest by narrow-minded men who have been left behind in the general development of the moral nature of our people, against a progress that they dislike. We can for a moment suppose that fifty years ago the general support coming to the great enterprise which Bishop Manning is leading so gloriously today would have been had? A broader minded public, a more tolerant public, a public with capacity for catching hold of the essential things of spiritual life and laying aside petty controversies about non-essential things has been exposed by this great campaign for the building of the great Cathedral.

We have become a more humane people, compassionate. Sympathy with distress and suffering, sense of the brotherhood of man, appears among the American people as nowhere ever before in the world, and that means a better people. It means a less narrow and less selfish people.

We have acquired a standard of national conduct which acknowledges the moral obligation of the nation. The Mexican war would not be possible today, people would not stand for it. The treatment of the Indians, which was a blot upon our history, would not be possible today. We would not stand for it, because we are a better people. Cuba and Porto Rico and the Philippines set off against the treatment of Mexico and the Indians show how our people have changed and grown in grace.

We are becoming a better educated people. I doubt not that Mr. Hughes and Mr. Beck will agree with me when I say that the young lawyers who are coming to the bar include a vast number of young men of the first ability, far better educated than

I was, or my associates were, when I came to the bar fifty-eight years ago. It is so with the physicians, far better educated, more scientific men, the physicians are. And the engineers, and all the great throng of men using their brains in the new professions, in all branches of science—and that means not such and such individuals, it means not the virtues of the Harvard Law School or the Yale Law School or the Columbia Law School, it means that we are in general becoming a better educated and more competent people. All over the land behold the rush of American youth to the colleges and universities for learning—nothing like it was ever seen in the world. The nearest that we can come to it is in that great crowding into the universities upon the dawn of the new learning that let the light in upon the darkness of the Middle Ages. The education is not always the wisest, it has serious defects. I think our educators are shrinking away from the fundamental idea of disciplinary study, with too much tendency to read their duty as being to convey to everybody all the information upon every subject that any one wants to know about; but nevertheless that is in a great measure because the teachers need to be taught, because the educators need to be educated, and that process is going on. All over the land these hundreds of thousands of growing, ambitious American youths are crowding into our universities and colleges to get learning. All over our country people are discussing, are reading, are forming opinions—often crude and ill informed opinions, but forming them with the best information they have, and seeking for more information, upon all the subjects of importance to human life, upon questions of domestic government, upon questions of constitutional application, upon questions of social order, upon questions of international duty and right; and the greatest process of universal education is going on now before our eyes that has ever been known.

Now, with all the things that go on, with all the things neglected, with all the foolish and wrong-headed things that are done, nevertheless, unless our whole theory of the ultimate competency of free men to govern themselves is wrong, unless the whole basis upon which free democratic government rests is wrong, America is on the road. I think great work has been done, I think great work is being done. The greatest things done do not come to the surface immediately; long, slow processes must change character and develop habits of thought; long, slow and painful processes are necessary; but I think we have—and I say it as an old man, with all the tendencies of age to criticize younger generations—I think we have the most cheerful evidence that nothing good and faithful done for our country in the past half century has been wasted.

Let me say one thing more. What has been done has been done by hard work. It has been no easy path, it could not be an easy path. The chief danger that threatens this process of enlarging the minds and hearts of the American people to full competency for government under the new and complex conditions of life comes from those who faint in the hard road, and who turn aside and seek new and easy paths by which to attain the end—and call that progress. It is not by finding new and easy ways to accomplish any work that it has ever yet been accomplished in this world; it is by holding hard to the handles of the plow and driving the furrow through. The complexity of life increases from year to year, the difficulties of government increase continually, but there never was a braver effort made to rise and still to meet the great emergency than the American people are making today in their effort to carry on their government and order their social life in accordance with the sound principles of justice and liberty.

My active life is ended, but I leave the field with faith, a deep and abiding faith in the competency of this people born and reared in the practice of individual liberty, to maintain their liberty with order and with justice, and to grow in the great process of developing self-government, to grow ever in capacity for feeling, and for following ideals of life, which rise above mere prosperity, mere security, and give what after all is the only thing worth accomplishing—achievement, not for one's self, but for others. Life is full of doubts and difficult questions to be solved; nevertheless, Senate or no Senate, Congress or no Congress, Legislature or no Legislature, Pacifists or no Pacifists, Bolsheviki or no Bolsheviki, I retire from active life with a firm conviction that the American people are growing every year into greater competency to maintain and give renewed life to the ideals of the fathers of the American Republic.

I wish to say one thing more: that in my judgment as an observer and as a reader of history, there has been no period in the life of the American Republic in which she has been served by abler men, answering to higher standards of conduct, or more unselfish patriotism, than she is today.

By permission of the author.

THE HISTORY OF COMMUNICATIONS

CLARENCE H. MACKAY

Clarence H. Mackay, New York capitalist, is president of the Commercial Cable Company and of the two Postal Telegraph-Cable companies that have extended their lines under the Atlantic and the Pacific; likewise of the Commercial Company of Cuba and the Commercial Pacific Cable Co., Director Metropolitan Opera Co., Treasurer of Lincoln Farm Association. Mr. Mackay was born in San Francisco in 1874.

This speech was delivered for the Radio Corporation of America, in New York, and was broadcast by them during the transatlantic Test in 1924.

Ladies and Gentlemen of the Radio Audience:—I feel that it is a great honor, as indeed it is a great pleasure, to be invited to address what I am assured is likely to be an international audience, during these transatlantic broadcasting tests. There is something almost appalling in the knowledge that messages sent out from this wonderful station will carry, practically instantaneously, to those who may be in remote places; that with the power of this station behind it, my voice will reach men thousands of miles away, and reach them faster than it would if I were to go out into the street and shout to some man only a few hundred feet away. Engineers have measured the speed of electrical impulses at something like one hundred and eighty-six thousand *miles* per second, whereas ordinary sound travels at only about one thousand, one hundred and forty *feet* per second. To make use of the greater speed, rather than the lesser, is the triumph of electrical communication in all its departments, for while my voice is going out through the air across the Atlantic, messages are being transmitted through submarine cables more than two miles below the surface of that ocean.

There may be those who wonder at the fact that the head of a system of cables and land-line telegraphs should be a speaker on this program. Yet I am conscious of a sense of fitness that there should be present and active in these events an exponent of the art of wired communications—present, let me say, not as a "landmark" by which to note the advance of radio, not as a symbol of things outworn and no longer serviceable to mankind, but rather in a fraternal and encouraging spirit, feeling as an older brother would feel at a demonstration of prowess by his own kith and kin.

Frankly, I have no feeling of being an outsider. The telegraph has seen another art of communication rise before the birth of radio—the art of telephony. Today the telegraph and telephone everywhere supplement each other; they even operate over the same wires in multiplex circuits. Telegrams and cablegrams are both started and delivered by telephone. Lately radio has become a member of this communications entente. It is practically impossible to discuss the cable, the telegraph, the telephone or radio alone in their relation to civilization, without discussing the others also. The truth is that we must consider electrical communications as a whole whenever we attempt to indicate how great a part any of these intelligence transmitters play in the affairs of mankind.

The era of electrical communications is still in its early youth. However, we of the cable and the telegraph have a background of nearly 80 years and, compared with us, radio is the merest infant—one of those amazing infants for whom no twin may be found in all the annals of human achievement.

I remember that Mr. Sarnoff, one of the brilliant officials of the Radio Corporation of America, once called attention to the fact that the world today retains and uses every facility of communication that has ever been developed. That is an interesting fact and it holds ample comfort for those who may have any fear of being placed upon the shelf. However, as I have said, we of the wired communications art look upon radio not as rivals, but as friends joined in the fellowship of service to mankind. The cable and telegraph render their own essential and important functions in this service. They cannot be *supplanted.* They are being *supplemented.* And I, for one, welcome the new art for its supplementing power.

I may say that mine are not idle expressions of friendship as between telegraph and radio. My companies are already in the third year of their co-operation under contract with the Radio Corporation of America for the collection and delivery of wireless messages of European destination and origin. When I was questioned many months ago by those who had been surprised at the negotiation of the contract, I made it clear that the Mackay System did not regard radio as a competitor, but as a welcome addition to the communications facilities of the world and I take pleasure in saying that nothing has occurred since that time to cause me to regret that expression of unselfish good will.

Nearly fifty years ago, Sir Robert Morier wrote that for all practical purposes this earth was "shrinking to the proportions of a middle-sized medieval state." If that was true fifty years ago, what shall be said now in these days of radio? If Sir Robert were here tonight, I wonder what simile he would employ —a pocket handkerchief perhaps.

Morier was marvelling at the sudden advance of communications marked by the commencement of telegraphy. In a few years' time he had seen more advance made in the art of communications than had been accomplished throughout all the history of mankind.

Before the era of electrical communications, the greatest communications discoveries were the arts of sailing a ship, of riding a horse, of building a road, simple and familiar matters indeed as compared with the stroke of genius which flings the tone of the human voice across the remote seas, conveying not merely the words of an address, the outline of a thought, but the authentic manifestation of the speaker's personality.

It was less than a century ago that the era of electrical communication began. The history of communications, until that time, was halting and uncertain. Mechanics, literature and the arts moved ahead as era succeeded era, but their progress was ever hindered and often their greatest potentialities were obscured by the failure of mankind to provide for his own needs in the matter of communication.

When it is considered that at the beginning of the Nineteenth Century there was not a mile of steam railroad, not a mile of electrical telegraph or cable, no telephone, no radio, no automobile—in a word, no communications facilities but human and animal legs, wheeled vehicles and wind-propelled vessels, one cannot help wondering how the business of the world was transacted as satisfactorily as it was.

Let us digress for a moment to fling a hasty glance across the score of centuries that preceded the era of electrical communications. Being a gregarious animal, man felt the need of communication from one tribe to another almost as soon as the desire of association and mutual protection had led to the organization of the tribe. We see at first the runner, chosen for his speed and endurance, prototype of that Marathon athlete who brought to Athens the glorious news of victory over Persia. We see in turn the development of signaling devices and codes of alternating smoke and flame, whereby the orders of a Roman general were flashed from point to point—we see, in short, the first wireless. Then the runner gives place to the mounted messenger, the man on horseback, the camel rider and he who used the sailing ship for transport. And having seen all this we have seen the history of communications up to the time of electricity.

The freeborn citizen of Rome in the time of Cicero was no worse off than a Frenchman of Napoleon's day in the matter of communications.

My friends in England who may be listening will not, I am sure, challenge the statement that England, no less than other countries, was backward in providing means of communication, chiefly because of her wretched roads. The great route through Wales to Holyhead was in such a state that as late as 1685 a Viceroy on his way to Ireland was five hours in traveling fourteen miles.

Perhaps the most striking incident in American history illustrating the cost of inadequate communications is the bloody battle of New Orleans. In that battle hundreds of men died whose quarrel had already reached an honorable adjustment in the Treaty of Ghent. The battle began the day that Treaty was signed.

America made an outstanding and romantic contribution to the development of communications before the real expansion of telegraph had begun. It was the Pony Express. The story of the Pony Express is fascinating. It was established in 1859 at the suggestion of Senator Gwin. There were five hundred horses, one hundred and ninety relay stations, and eighty first-class riders. Among the latter, the famous Buffalo Bill was soon numbered. Letters had to be written on tissue paper and the postage at first was $5 for less than ½ ounce. Even the expert, lightly armed riders took ten days to reach the Pacific Coast from Missouri.

Against this background of hindered growth, of unconquered obstacles, there suddenly dawned, in the Nineteenth Century, the era of electrical communication. It was as if the genius of mankind for communications, pent up for all the centuries before, had swiftly burst its bonds, resolved to atone for all past backwardness.

It was in 1844 that Samuel F. B. Morse revealed to the world the great invention of the telegraph; 1850 is the first big date in the history of submarine cables. In that year a thirty-mile cable was laid from Dover, England, across the English Channel, the culmination of many years of theorizing and experiment. It was the first of many ventures and preceded by eight years the spanning of the Atlantic by submarine cable, made possible by the genius of that great American, Cyrus W. Field.

And now the art of communications moved at a giant's pace as contrasted with the slow progress of the centuries before. Scientific genius concentrated upon the problem of improving the art. Organization genius was concentrated upon the expansion of service. Financial resources were provided in abundance and the great American spirit of competition that has so outstandingly characterized our material achievement was seen in some of its most colorful chapters.

It is gratifying to know that America now leads—leads not only in radio, but in the entire field of electrical communications. Our census reports for 1922 show 76,711 nautical miles of ocean cable and nearly two million miles of single wire owned and leased for land-line purposes. The combined cables and telegraphs of America handled nearly two hundred million messages in 1922—a volume that has been vastly increased since that record was made. The Department of Commerce reports in 1923 a total telephone wire mileage of more than thirty-four million miles and the ownership of more than fifteen million telephones, exchanging nearly forty-three million messages daily.

In the field of radio we find more than five hundred American broadcasting stations, sending out their daily programs of music, lectures, news and other entertainment to something like five million owners of radio receiving sets.

Could anything be more amazing, more impressive than this vast development which has taken place in less than eighty years? The communications system of America is one of the greatest monuments to America's many-sided genius. In viewing it thus, as a united organism of public service, let us not ignore the fact that it is also a monument to individual enterprise and initiative. It could not have been accomplished except in the typically American way of untrammelled action. The giant grew without being fed upon the nursebottle of bureaucratic control. Perhaps he could not have survived pampering, coddling and interference.

There was a time when the difficulty of communication prompted alliances among the nations. The dangers and inadequacies of the roads and posts really called into existence the famous Hanseatic League. About 1241 the League inaugurated a kind of regular messenger service to facilitate commercial and financial transactions among its member cities. Powerfully armed vessels protected the League's commerce at sea against Scandinavian pirates. The roads were used for communications in all directions. Only the merchants of the Hanseatic League and of Venice could at that time count upon a certain degree of international communication.

And today we witness a different sort of development. We see communications as a positive and compelling force drawing men and nations together by the mighty force of sympathy and understanding.

There was high appropriateness in the fact that Mr. Owen D. Young, the presiding and organizing genius of radio in America, was the associate of General Dawes in rendering such vital services in eradicating after-war misunderstandings. In his two missions abroad, wherein he wielded such extraordinary power for good, Mr. Young, I like to think, personified the ideal and spirit of communications.

It has often been said that the war set civilization back many centuries. In many respects that is true. In many respects it is untrue. Today there is every evidence of a spirit of unbeatable optimism in the world at large—not to ignore the splendid confidence that permeates the business world both here and in England. The lessons of the war seem to have been exposed in the white light of transmitted intelligence.

Perhaps many of you listened and were impressed the night before election by the utterance over the radio with which President Coolidge brought the campaign to a close. He spoke no longer as a candidate or partisan. It was the voice of the President of the United States that we heard—the voice of a great President, summoning his fellow citizens to the performance of a high duty in accordance with the dictates of their conscience.

It is not difficult to forecast the time when the voice of some great English-speaking leader may sound his appeal to friends and followers on both sides of the Atlantic. There is an old saying of our elections, not always true, indeed, that "As New York goes, so goes the Nation." May it not ultimately come about, through the cementing of opinion and sympathy, that in the great affairs of mankind, "As America goes and England goes, so go the nations of the world"?

Communication is the reconciler of differences, the promoter of understanding—it levels up, not down. We who stand to-day on the threshold of the age of international broadcasting may well be thrilled and inspired by the belief that a liberalizing and constructive force of immeasurable momentum has been generated. God speed the day of its full action upon the history of mankind. All honor and praise to the great engineers and guiding geniuses of the Radio Corporation of America.

By permission of *The Postal Telegraph.*

DID WOODROW WILSON FAIL?

CHARLES ZUEBLIN

Charles Zueblin was born in Pendleton, Indiana, in 1866. He died at Geneva in 1924. Mr. Zueblin had been a professor of sociology at the University of Chicago, and an able Chautauqua and Lyceum lecturer; had written several books on civic and political topics, and had traveled widely. This address was delivered on Chautauqua circuits.

THE President of the United States, elected by the whole people, is always in the limelight. This popular idol was created by the framers of the Constitution, whose dead hands constantly are stretched out over the capital of the republic. The President is the last resort of a people who find constitutional delays exasperating and political parties irresponsible. An aggressive man in the White House can overcome both constitutional and partisan obstruction, but he pays the price of congressional opposition, party suspicion, and finally popular disapproval. No man has tried for two terms to carry out the will of the people without becoming in the end the victim of the mob.

This exaggeration of the personality of the President began with Washington and did not diminish with Wilson. The outstanding Presidents of American history have all met the same fate. Washington harmonized the jealous forces of our nativity; his worshipers would have made him king; the crowd came to regard him in their hearts as the rabble did Cæsar. Jefferson—the antidote to Washington and Hamilton—surrendered his daring conviction of decentralization and stirred the pride of the new nation by his unexpected Louisiana Purchase; he died a forsaken old man at Monticello. Jackson won over his states-rights followers by his bold subjugation of the nullifiers of the union; he was the demi-god of demos, but he left the White House in the hands of an army of spoilsmen. Lincoln saved us from secession, but his assassin killed the loneliest figure in our history.

When ex-president Roosevelt returned from his African exploits, he recovered for a moment the prestige besmirched by congressional misrepresentation. After a brief literary flare, a couple of vaudeville comedians in a skit were discussing the great naturalist's African discoveries; a lull in the dialogue was followed by the query of one of them: "What ever became of him?" We might never have been able to give an adequate answer to the Philistines had not his enemies' hatred of Wilson forced them to choose the ills they forgave in T. R. rather than to fly to those they knew not of.

These men all had the tacit approval of the American people. The voices of their supporters were hushed in the noise of their critics. The only affirmative Presidents since Lincoln—Roosevelt and Wilson—have been worshiped and cast down from their pedestals by a people who depended on them, but did not support them. In the height of their popularity an obstructive Congress was chosen which, in each case, insinuated that the feet of the people's idol were of clay. Wilson was the spiritual heir of Roosevelt, as Roosevelt was the heir of Bryan. Wilson came into office to lead a people who had not only been quickened by the campaigns of Bryan and the administrations of Roosevelt, but aroused to indignation by the moral and political reaction under Taft. The nation had been sold out; the Supreme Court had been packed; corruptionists controlled the Republican convention when Bryan imposed Wilson on the American people at the Democratic Convention of 1912.

Nominated by Bryan, elected by Roosevelt's splitting the Republican party, Wilson, in his inaugural address, March 4, 1913, declared "This is not a day of triumph. It is a day of dedication. Here muster, not the forces of party, but the forces of humanity. . . . I summon all honest men, all patriots, all forward looking men to my side. God helping me, I will not fail them, if they will but counsel and sustain me." This is the voice of a President, not a partisan. It reveals the spirit of Wilson; it suggests the limitations of Wilson and of America. He appeals to all honest men; he had not then learned to appeal to women. He invites the voters to counsel him; he was doubtless unaware of his reluctance to accept counsel, though he must have known that the American people do not counsel, they criticise; while Congress, ignored by the people, lies in wait for presidential blunders.

As early as 1885, Wilson had written a thesis for his Doctor's degree at Johns Hopkins University, which remains to this day the best treatise ever written on Congressional government. Although a minority candidate in 1913, he was very conscious of the authoritative mandate of the majority. With a friendly Congress, under his gifted statesmanship there was passed a greater volume of progressive legislation than any predecessor had secured, not excepting Roosevelt. His growing vision was, however, too great for Congress. In his second message, December, 1914, he advocated a government-built Merchant Marine, which would have been of incalculable service in the World War. The plan was defeated by Congressmen and Senators who were later among the chief critics of unpreparedness.

Six months after the sinking of the Lusitania, a year and a half before we entered the war, Wilson had the temerity to launch a preparedness campaign, but he only advocated a citizen army and the strengthening of the National Guard. He was still in his own mind unready for general, federal, military preparedness, but so was the nation. He says, almost plaintively: "The chief thing necessary is that the real voice of the nation should sound forth unmistakably and in majestic volume in the deep unison of a common, unhesitating, national feeling." The campaign for preparedness was pushed by the President through the first months of 1916, but Congress did nothing.

President Wilson confessed to having learned much in fourteen months. Congress was too voluble to be taught. The people were engaged in not too "watchful waiting." Wilson's critics made much of his phrase of studious caution. It was not, however, a phrase of inactivity. It was the expression of an alert man, earnestly feeling the national pulse with one hand, while the other was manacled to the Constitution. That document denies in the legislative halls authoritative leadership to the executive. February 1, 1916, in the midst of the preparedness campaign, nine months after the sinking of the Lusitania, the President says, "Do you want the situation to be such that all the President can do is to write messages; to utter words of protest? If these breaches of international law, which are in daily danger of occurring, should touch the very vital interests and honor of the United States, do you wish to do nothing about it?"

Was the President dilatory in meeting a crisis? What were the people and their representatives doing to the President? Resolutions were presented in both House and Senate warning Americans not to travel on armed merchantmen. These resolutions were supported by ex-Secretary Bryan. The President said defiantly: "To forbid our people to exercise their rights for fear we might be called upon to vindicate them would be a deep humiliation indeed." The people were leaning on the President, not upholding him, and a Congress of his own political faith thought it could articulate the will of the people better than the President. Senator Jones presented a resolution, "It is the sense of the Senate of the United States of America that any issue claimed to affect the national honor should be referred to the Congress of the United States and no ultimatum should be sent to any belligerent power and no severance of diplomatic relations be brought about by Executive action."

The President was learning rapidly, but not from Congress. At the Gridiron Club, February 26, 1916, he said he would "a great deal rather know" what men were "talking about around quiet firesides than what they were talking about in the cloak rooms of Congress. . . . The report that there are divided councils in Congress in regard to the foreign policy of the Country, is being made industrious use of in foreign capitals." The President pressed Congress for some decision for a vote on travel by sea: Should our people involve the nation by exercising their personal independence, or should they not? The President was watchful. Congress was waiting. The Senate and the House proved irresponsible. Resolutions were brought up in both House and Senate to test the sentiment of each. Senator Gore's resolution provided that the loss of life of a citizen of the United States from a vessel sunk without warning by a German submarine would constitute a cause of war. While the President was being assailed by the military minority led by Roosevelt, an irresolute Congress sustained the Fathers by trying to tie the President's other hand. The resolution was tabled in the Senate by a vote of 68 to 14 and the corresponding resolution in the House was tabled, 276 to 142. This was one year after the sinking of the Lusitania.

Then a complacent people, unconcerned about the devastation of Europe, feeling secure in their pacific faith, had war brought home by the raid of Columbus, New Mexico, by Villa, March 9, 1916. Two months later, the militia of the neighboring states, with 4,000 regular army men, were sent to the border. In a month more, the President's preparedness bill was ready for his signature!

Our President must think for the people; he must think into the future, but he must act in the present. There were divided counsels over the pursuit of Villa into Mexico. There were constitutionalist, pacifist, militarist opinions. These were all dissolved in the subsequent events. What crystallized judgment which has hounded Wilson to this day, was an accidental by-product of the world war. The supplying of food and munitions to the Allies was stimulating a fabulous prosperity in the United States. Railroads and railroad men were being taxed to their capacity. The transportation of supplies both to Europe and to Mexico, gave certain railroad men their long awaited opportunity to make demands for higher wages. They suddenly issued an ultimatum which threatened a national strike unless they secured a basic eight hour day and an increase in wages. President Wilson divined the future and capitulated to the railroad workers' demands. The Adamson bill, guaranteeing ten hours' wages for the eight hour day, was hurriedly passed, signed September 3, 1916, upheld shortly by the Supreme Court, and the powers of Congress were immensely enlarged. The Interstate Commerce act of 1887 had put the making of railroad rates constitutionally within the hands of Congressmen. Now they were endowed with the constitutional power to regulate wages. No eye has yet penetrated to the remote consequences of this act, but the financial forces of the nation intuitively felt its revolutionary character. Ths is Wilson's mark of Cain, which made him the target of the reactionaries as a Bertillon record convinces a plain-clothes man. Throughout a war to which they were compelled to give their support, a war led to a successful conclusion by extraordinary executive ability, the President was maligned and belittled by the organizations and the newspapers of the Tories. Wilson saved the war profits of the profiteers by capitulating to Labor, but the Adamson Bill was his doom.

During the campaign for re-election when President Wilson was trying his utmost to feel and voice the will of the nation, he revealed his personal situation with deep pathos, in his address at the opening of the Lincoln Memorial at Hodgenville, Ky.: "It was a very lonely spirit that looked out from underneath those shaggy brows and comprehended men without fully communing with them, as if, in spite of all its genial efforts at comradeship, it dwelt apart, saw its visions of duty where no man looked on. There is a very holy and a very terrible isolation for the conscience of every man who seeks to read the destiny in affairs for others as well as for himself; for a nation as well as for individuals." The President stood alone. Congress was a Babel of inconsequential voices. The real voice of the nation had not sounded "in majestic volume." The profiteers' press rumbled with angry condemnation of the Adamson bill. But the solitary figure of 1916 communed with the "lonely spirit" of 1863, seeking "to read the destiny in affairs for others as well as for himself."

This isolated man was re-elected because "he kept us out of war." Bent on fulfilling his promise, he drafted a peace note in which he stated the terms on which peace might be made and maintained. The world was much mystified and shocked, when, after the Kaiser had made a peace address to the Reichstag, December 12, 1916, Wilson followed with a peace note to the Powers within six days. Germany at that time occupied a formidable position at the front. It was an excellent time for the Kaiser to put out a peace feeler. It seemed like an anti-climax for Wilson to follow it with his "peace without victory" proclamation. We now know that Wilson was carrying out his campaign pledge and that the Kaiser got wind of it in time to hasten his own announcement to the world.

The storm which Wilson's peace note raised was due partly to misunderstanding and partly to the failure of his critics to get the long perspective that was his. It was not an ingratiating statement to our future allies which he made in saying, "that the objects which the statesman of the belligerents on both sides *have in mind* in this war, are virtually the same *as stated in general terms* to their own people and the world." The President's foreign and domestic critics pounced on this truism, as usual, without reading the context (here italicized). He went on to say, "Each wishes to be made secure in the future. . . . Each would be jealous of the formation of any more rival Leagues to preserve an uncertain balance of power amid multiplying suspicions; but each is ready to consider the formation of a league of nations." In the intemperance of war the clamor of the critics was inevitably more in evidence than the calm thought of those who were ready to learn.

The unanimity of opposition in those early days of 1917 might confuse a cynic in 1924. One American paper said it meant peace "made in Prussia." The London *Mail* "searched in vain for any expression of sympathy with those who were shedding their blood for freedom." The Berlin *Tages Zeitung's* comment was that peace without victory meant the ruin of the German empire. Above these contradictions was the clear note of John Dillon saying "unquestionably, the most remarkable and momentous utterance by the ruler of a great power for more than a hundred years."

It may be too soon to measure Wilson's courage and insight, for the week after his peace note Germany announced ruthless submarine warfare. The President had been re-elected because he "kept us out of war" and a month before his second inaugural, Germany met the "peace without victory" note by majestically announcing that the United States would be allowed to send one ship a week, each way, across the Atlantic! It was inevitable that the German ambassador should receive his passports. The growing volume of impatience in America and among the Allies had been met by Germany's insane provocation. Those who were trying to find a way to avoid war, urged armed neutrality. This coincided with the revelation of the Zimmerman plot in Mexico, the last of February.

Once more, we were provoked to action by the deed at our doors. The armed ship bill passed the House March 1, by a vote of 403 to 13. One year before, the President's insistent demands for some affirmative action on this question was met by tabling the resolution about the loss of life of an American citizen, by a vote of 276 to 142. At the earlier date, the President had confessed to having learned much in fourteen months. A year later, the House had learned something, but the Senate filibustered till the end of the 64th Congress. Whether we went to war or not, Congress could remain futile and inactive. The President would have to guess at the will of the people, but he would also have to take the blame. The President had surely tried to keep us out of war when he entered on his second administration, but there was no doubt as to his readiness when he sent a message over the wires to the American people, "In the most far-reaching crisis of all our international relations Congress had been unable to act."

These two obstructive legislative bodies had not only failed to assist the President in articulating the will of the American people, but in their volume of talk they had failed to enact imperative domestic legislation, including a plan for combinations of capital for export trade; the increase of the Interstate Commerce Commission; the release of minerals in public lands; the regulation of water power; army appropriations, and the Shipping Board; all helpful non-partisan forms of preparedness for war or peace. The truth of the President's comment is as humiliating in 1924 as it was in 1917. "The impression made abroad will be . . . that other governments may act as they please without fear that this government can do anything at all."

Despite the inactivity of Congress, decision was compelled once more by an outside force. On March 12, the red flag of the revolution replaced the colors of Russia in Petrograd. Three days later, the Czar abdicated. The next day we received this news, coincident with overt acts by Germany—the sinking of three American ships. The Russian revolution afforded the positive incitement to war which had its negative counterpart in the imbecility of the German naval authorities. War was declared April 5.

If we were to play our part in a war which was going increasingly against the Allies, we must mobilize the nation, providing so huge an army that we could not hope to secure volunteers with sufficient speed. Nothing indicated better how far Wilson had been ahead of the people, or how quickly the country responded when war was declared, than the passage of the draft bill and the appointment of registration day, precisely two months after the President's declaration. This most revolutionary act since the Emancipation Proclamation ran counter to our traditions and those of the Anglo-Saxon people, but it gave us an army representative of every section of our population, an army which did not completely disorganize industry, the army which finished the war.

Those who know how little they knew in the summer of 1917, cannot review the other processes of national mobilization without marveling at the unsupported leadership of President Wilson. Here was a nation thoroughly pacific, a nation which throughout its history has evaded preparedness, a nation most of whose powerful elements had not only never done anything in a national spirit, but were perpetually active opponents of the government and in many instances corrupters of the government, a nation poisoned with distrust of the President by the opponents of the income tax and the Adamson bill. This nation mobilized with greater speed and success than had ever been recorded in all the annals of history.

At the end of the year 1917 only the President was serene. The private railway system had collapsed, and it was necessary for the administration to take over the railways. Reactionary employers accused the War Labor Board of "coddling labor." Uninformed militarists charged the War Department with "not functioning." The facts were, that the war could not have gone on at all if labor had not been propitiated; that the Allies were in a panic because our private railway managers had achieved a hopeless congestion along the Atlantic Seaboard; that the War Department had gathered nearly a million men into cantonments built in an incredibly brief time, in the face of labor shortage and expensive materials, but could not send them abroad until there were ships in which to transport them and the nation was mobilized for their support.

When one considers the menace of the German submarine, the impoverishment of France, the necessity of our constructing not only docks but ports and an entire railroad system in France, transporting men and materials from four to seven thousand miles, while feeding the Allies from the resources of a country filled with pro-Germans, anti-British, friendless aliens, conscientious pacifists and justly dissatisfied Negroes, it would seem that some credit might be given to the chief executive who created and directed all the necessary agencies to produce a victory in the Argonne Wood months ahead of the fondest dream of the ablest military experts of the war.

The war had been won, but not "according to the perfect manner of the law of the Fathers." It would not have been possible more faithfully to "execute the office of President" (the words of the President's oath of office), but Mr. Wilson had offended the leaders of the Republican Party, the Democratic

Party, the Woman's Party, the pacifists, the militarists, the reactionaries, the radicals, Wall Street and the Negroes; his political execution was inevitable; his hold even on life insecure. Anyone who took the war seriously suffered brainstorm, if not physical injury. Roosevelt virtually went mad; many of us cannot yet talk sanely on war topics. It was a constant subject of discussion by friend and foe, how Mr. Wilson maintained his seemingly cold-blooded serenity in the midst of domestic and foreign pressure, the fluctuations of the war, even death and marriage. True, he obeyed literally a ubiquitous and devoted physician; he played golf; he retreated into his Scotch-Irish privacy; but like the rest of us he—the one who bore burdens equal to our collective cares—was being bodily and spiritually undermined.

His first grave blunder of the war was his appeal to the electorate to restore a partisan majority to Congress. We may debate the wisdom of his going in person to Paris, with a disloyal Foreign Minister in an inadequate Commission; we may justify or not his succeeding compromises, his abandonment of the Fourteen Points, his heroic decision to come home in the midst of the Conference, his defence of the Versailles Treaty on his return to America; but we cannot ignore the fact that an invalid could make no decision that half the country would support. He might have revolutionized the methods of diplomacy and brought the people of the world who long for self-government within reach of their goal if he had come home on the George Washington, but imagine what Senator Lodge and the other jealous critics would have said of a quitter! He might have stood by Ireland and sacrificed our hopes and responsibilities in the Pacific. Who dares think of the reaction in Ulster and California! He might have shown a tithe of the courage needed for the advocacy of the Adamson Bill by releasing Debs, his Socialist opponent in the presidential contest, jailed for failure to support the war; but he was a broken man, irresponsible, martyred not like Garfield and McKinley, but like Washington and Jefferson, by defamation.

The defection of Wilson from his own Fourteen Points has been as mysterious to Europeans as America's shirking of responsibilities since the war; Germany regards herself as the mere dupe of Wilson. The only explanation, at the same time apology, is that he was not physically equal to his task, for which Americans and Europeans are responsible. Perhaps the frank admission of America's guilt gives one the privilege of saying a bold word to Europeans. It was absolutely necessary at the end of January, 1919, for the President to return to America to win us to the support of the Covenant, without which as Wilson rightly told us there could be no peace. We had had our minds so poisoned by his envious rivals that we shared responsibility with the Senate for sending him back to Paris a ruined Statesman.

While the President was absent in America the triumvirate of French, Italian and British statesmen stacked the cards against Wilson, and he had no chance thereafter to do more than accept all the disgraceful compromises that defrauded the people of the world of their rightful peace. Unhappily when he came home finally he collapsed in his vain attempt to convert us to the crime of Versailles, which the Senate, whatever its motives, wisely rejected. Just before his tragic death he gained, after four years of purgatory, enough energy and prestige to say that America's post-war conduct had been "ignoble, cowardly and dishonorable." He has had a tragic share in our shame by having advocated the Treaty, as well as the Covenant. Yet the Allies will not understand Wilson and America till they face the "ignoble, cowardly and dishonorable" acceptance of the Versailles Treaty by their representatives.

The time has come not to justify all of Wilson's acts, still less those of America, but for a mutual heart-searching of the British Empire, France and America. What a world it might be if we had not "muddled through," but had had "a peace without victory"! What a country would be ours if we showed more sanity during the campaign and more loyalty after election!

By permission of the author.

AMERICA'S RÔLE IN EUROPE

JEREMIAH WHIPPLE JENKS

Jeremiah Whipple Jenks, political economist, educator, and author, was a professor of government and of political and social science in several of our large universities. He was research professor of government and public administration in New York University, and chairman of the board of directors of Alexander Hamilton Institute. His numerous books are authorities and standard texts for students. He had been called upon by the United States Government to serve on special and extraordinary commissions both here and abroad. Dr. Jenks was born in St. Clair, Michigan, in 1856 and died August 24, 1929. He held the LL.D. of the University of Michigan and the PH.D. of the University of Halle.

This address was made at the commencement exercises of New York University, June, 1924.

"AMERICA must help us. We cannot save ourselves." Some of the most experienced and wisest businessmen and statesmen in Europe have expressed this judgment to me personally in Constantinople, Belgrade, Budapest, Vienna, Berlin; and their judgment has been confirmed in Paris and London. The successive failures of the various meetings of the prime ministers of the allied countries and of the Brussels and Genoa Conventions to reach any satisfactory solution of the reparations problem adds emphasis to these assertions. The declaration of Mr. W. M. Hughes, former Prime Minister of Australia, that the world is desperately ill and must have aid, and that the aid of America is essential, confirms this judgment. The willingness of the Reparations Commission, under the leadership of France, to modify the form of its invitation for an international conference, which eventuated in the Dawes Committee, gives final proof of the desperate character of Europe's need and the vital necessity of America's taking a leading part in bringing relief.

A summary of Europe's ills would show them to be of various kinds—economic, covering the business condition of the people; financial, treating of governmental budgets and monetary systems; political, dealing with internal politics and foreign relations; moral, because all their ills have come from the working out of human motives and human passions, especially selfishness, race prejudice, suspicion, fear, hate.

The first great cause of the economic ills was the war. You cannot kill off thirteen millions of the active workers of the world, including a large percentage of the best supervising and directing heads as well as many of the best creative minds, without demoralizing the world's business. When to this you add direct costs of two hundred billion dollars plus indirect costs of thirty billions' worth of property, business and industry for purposes of progress become chaos, and time, energy, and thought must be devoted to building up again from small beginnings the great organization needed for carrying on the world's work along useful rather than destructive lines.

The war left Europe in chaos. According to the best estimates, the returns from agriculture and from industry were at least forty per cent below normal after the war. With the passage of time (that greatest healer of human ills), the opportunities for again fertilizing and working the soil, and the gradual replacement of farm animals, agricultural implements and labor, have steadily increased the returns from agriculture, until in many cases they are now back to their pre-war standard.

Likewise in industry conditions are improving. In individual instances, as was the case after the San Francisco earthquake and fire, factories have been replaced with those of better standards and more modern improvements, so that the output now is even greater than before the war. Of course, these cases are exceptional. Doubtless yet, as regards shipping, commerce, and production along most lines, conditions are still below pre-war standards, but they are much better than they were three years ago, and the improvement seems steady and sure.

So it is also in other fields. The monetary systems of most countries, although still bad, are greatly improved; their budgets, although not yet balanced, show an element of hope; their political conditions internally are still unsatisfactory, but with decided changes, some favorable, others unfavorable.

In the reaction after the war, when thrones were toppling and aristocracies falling, the oppressed people naturally went to extremes of democracy, in certain cases to Bolshevism, in others to socialism. In nearly all cases the oppressed laboring classes, seeing their opportunity, attempted to grasp at once all the benefits of freedom, even at the expense of the wealthy and well-to-do classes. Naturally the extremes of democracy have brought about a reaction likewise extreme. In Italy, Mussolini created a dictatorship. Austria was compelled to put the direction of her government into the hands of an appointee of the League of Nations. Hungary is now following her example. Poland and Germany temporarily voted full power to their cabinets. This revolt against extreme democracy has decidedly improved economic conditions, but has brought about too strong a leaning toward despotism. The golden mean is yet to be reached.

In external politics, jealousies and fear still maintain too great barriers to intercourse between the nations; but here, too, economic pressure has improved conditions in the greater part of Europe. The tension between Germany and France was strained almost to the breaking point by the invasion of the Ruhr, and the last year has witnessed a distinct increase in the bitterness of the hatreds, and the consequent danger of violence unless new remedies can be found.

Most important of all perhaps, these problems have a moral aspect, for most of these ills—political, financial, economic—when traced to their causes have sprung from human motives of individuals and classes of the population that, as has been said, are selfish in their nature. In the field of international affairs, the purposes of governments have been not helpfulness toward one another or co-operation for the common good, but in some instances exploitation, in others injurious expenditures for purposes of defence, caused by fear of unjust acts of their neighbors. Thus not the best motives, but evil motives, however natural, especially desire for gain, and glory and fear, have driven the nations into their present unhappy state. The remedies, therefore, for these ills, if they are to prove not merely palliatives but really permanent cures, must be fundamental changes in the attitude of the nations. The nations must be inspired, not by selfishness, but by a farsighted and enlightened self-interest. This will point toward co-operation for the general welfare, instead of isolation or exploitation.

It is best to be specific. The most important question which, more than any other one influence, has been the cause of the greatest distress in the economic, financial and political fields—all three—and which has also raised the greatest moral issues since the war, has been the reparations question, with the chief protagonists France and Germany. Here again, we need not criticize in any hostile spirit the intentions of any parties to the controversy. Surely all of the Allies, but especially Belgium and France, had endured suffering so intense—in properties, in lives, in physical pain, in mental anguish—that they naturally have felt that no reparations, however large, can ever pay for the sufferings endured. On the other hand, however, their war antagonists in Bulgaria, Hungary, Austria, and Germany, some for one reason and some for another, have all believed that the demands made upon them as the losers in the great game of war have been so exorbitant that they cannot possibly pay them, and that the chief purpose of the demands has been not pay for their enemies but their own ruin. This they have struggled against. Naturally they would resist an effort to ruin them.

Moreover, the methods employed by the interallied nations to enforce the penalties have, they felt, been most unjust, often brutal and very expensive. The bills of the troops of occupation and of the Allied Commissions have been enormous. Again, the defeated nations were forced against their wills and, in most instances, even against their honest convictions, to declare themselves in the treaty of peace guilty of having caused the war. The majority in all the defeated countries do not believe the statement. The Hungarians feel that they were dragged into a war which they did not originate and which, on the whole, they disapproved; the great mass of the German and Austrian peoples even today believe that they were forced to fight a defensive war. I was in Berlin when the war started, August 1, 1914. I saw the military propaganda. I am truthfully reporting opinions. I am not judging questions of right or wrong.

With these different viewpoints it was natural that on the one hand the Germans should pay reparations unwillingly, and equally natural on the other, that the French and Belgians should become more insistent. Moreover, the resistance of the Germans caused lessened ability to pay; and with the cessation of the payments of reparations came the greater need on the part of the Allies. France and Belgium were tottering on the verge of governmental bankruptcy. In consequence, for the last year, the trend toward peace has been blocked by an increasing bitterness of hatreds extremely ominous for the future. A year and a half ago the Germans were sad, almost hopeless, but submissive, enduring. There was little talk of resistance. Within the last six months, stirred by what they believed to be countless acts unjust, treacherous and cruel, committed by French soldiers in the Ruhr, the situation has materially changed. Especially do the Germans accuse the French of treacherous and false misrepresentations regarding the alleged independence movements in the Rhineland. They have been told that the great body of the insurrectionists were hirelings, often criminals in French pay; and they believe that the revolutions in the Rhineland are French-made products for the political end of dismembering Germany and thus ruining her.

On the other side, the French in their normal and well justified fear of the future believed that Germany must not be permitted to grow strong and that if it could be brought about, a barrier must be raised between France and Germany. Out of this conflict of views or interests have grown the bitterest of hatreds between these peoples. And yet the feelings on neither side are universal. Not all Germans are attempting to cheat the Allies out of their just dues. One of the coolest headed, fairest minded of them said to me not long ago: "In settling the reparations problem, we must consider not only what Germany can pay, but also what France must have. France too is suffering. Her government is practically bankrupt. We must consider her, too, as well as ourselves." And not all Frenchmen favor harsh methods. Men of influence and character have said: "Our policy in the Ruhr was a mistake. Though we must be safe, Germany must live." It is clear that the remedy must take on a moral quality. These feelings of mutual consideration must become widespread.

And this is not all. The reparations problem concerns others too besides these chief contenders. Great Britain, herself suffering gravely under the burdens left by the war, with more than a million men unemployed, with taxes greatly increased not only by heavy pensions for those disabled during the war and their dependents, and by large unemployment doles, as well as by the heroic efforts made to meet to the full her obligations, including those to America, found her interests in conflict with those of her continental allies. England as a manufacturing and trading country needs to enlarge her markets. It is for her interest that Germany become again one of her most important customers and that to this end German industry should not be destroyed but rebuilt and developed. The occupation of the Ruhr by the French and Belgians England considered not only an economic and political mistake, but also an act contrary to the Treaty of Versailles. Effort after effort was made to lessen the differences and allay the suspicions, but with little effect. At times it seemed as if the Anglo-French entente would be broken. Not only interest, but pride and patriotism were aroused. A mediator was needed. When the development of the situation is studied carefully, it becomes evident that America's help was imperative. Without it there remained only a small and decreasing hope of any reasonable solution; hence came the Dawes Committee.

What remedies can be found?

In the period immediately following the war, famine and disease stalked through the countries of Central Europe with death in their train. Hundreds of thousands perished, and the danger and suffering were indescribable. America responded to the cry for help. Money for food, clothing, and often shelter, was sent by millions of dollars. Now need for that kind of relief has been largely overcome.

Next a constructive policy in business and government was imperative. Here again the men who had brought financial and material relief were at times kept as governmental advisers to help rebuild and reorganize industrial and governmental institutions. That work, too, has made progress. In the financial rehabilitation America has borne her part in buying bonds and rebuilding economic and industrial institutions.

Along political and moral lines so far her influence has been less felt, although certain steps have been taken in those directions.

As we have seen, out of normal patriotic motives, influenced not a little by fear as well as by old-time hostilities and differences of ideals, have grown suspicions and distrust and hatreds. Heroic efforts were made before and at the peace conference at Versailles by an American President to exert a harmonizing influence through the League of Nations; but the old time European habits of selfish diplomacy on the one hand, coupled on our side with pride of opinion, partisan jealousies, and fear of foreign entanglements, prevented the attainment of the desired results. America remained outside the League.

And yet, America could not and does not wish to cut herself off from the rest of the world; she did wish and does wish to retain the right of independent action. As time has gone by, however, with this independence of action has come a mellowing of our methods. At first we worked only informally with the League; we had only unofficial representation on the Reparations Commission and other interallied bodies. Later, in the social reform work of the League, especially in the discussions on opium and traffic in women and children, we have been officially represented, and the American voice has been largely decisive. Really we have determined the policies.

On the political side, however, in connection with the great question of reparations, little progress had been made, until after various attempts and failures, the Dawes Committee was appointed.

Before we can wisely prescribe remedies, we must diagnose the ills to be cured. When the ills of a state are political and social, as in the case of a man whose disease is psychic, one needs to make a sharp distinction between the remedy which the patient thinks he needs and the remedy that he really does need.

What most of the countries of Europe thought they needed was material financial relief. As was natural, they felt generally that, granted the wealth, they needed no help to administer it; and yet, we know now that advice and scientific aid were needed, and that mere loans of millions would not have settled their problems. Indeed, our millions given without control might well have created new ones.

And what rôle does Europe now expect us and wish us to play? Our financial aid she still wants and needs. There have been and still are to be requests for loans or other forms of financial assistance from Austria, Germany, Poland, Hungary, Jugo-Slavia, Italy—practically all of Europe; but their feeling of need, aside from a few far-sighted thinkers, generally stops with money and credit. What more does Europe really need? Can we meet her needs? If the foregoing analysis has been correct, the need for money and credits, great as it really is, is far less than the need for a change of heart, a new outlook for the future; a need for the removal of suspicions, the allaying of hate, the awakening of a spirit of conciliation, the development of a spirit of mutual helpfulness, and within each country order and law.

Let us consider first internal needs. In this field we can give the financial help desired, but the help will largely lose its value unless given under right conditions. The time has gone by for charity; the time has come for real business. Loans made should be amply secured, but the security must not be only taxes or claims on goods or pledges of properties. It must include a sane and safe political organization bent on doing justice. When loans were considered in Jugo-Slavia, Poland, and Germany a few months ago, the first questions asked by the foreign financiers were: "Is property safe? Is there danger of revolution? Will foreign countries invade the territory? Will the government be stable? Do the people really feel responsibility? What is the likelihood of peace?"

In one morning in Berlin I asked three men, Hugo Stinnes, the Prime Minister, the President: "Is private property safe in Germany? May foreign investors feel secure?" Stinnes said: "Property is secure in all but three states. If you will grant credits in all other states, and refuse them in those three because you fear communism, credits will be safe there, too, within sixty days." The Chancellor and President said: "Property is safe and life is safe. We shall have a few bread riots, an attempt or two at revolution. (This, the week before the Ludendorff "putsch" that proved such a fiasco.) But our army, though small, is efficient and thoroughly loyal to the government. Our police force likewise small is well trained and will obey. Every attempt at disorder will be promptly put down. Property is safe. Your investors may rest in peace." But foreign investors want more than order maintained by force. They want an order of good will, safety based on good feeling, obligations met from a sense of duty, payments and protection to life and property given for conscience' sake.

These they can have in Germany or elsewhere when the human motives are right. And human motives will become right when all sides feel that justice will be done and that there is no longer fear of tyranny and brutal oppression.

As America is fortunate enough at the present time to be able to furnish financial aid, so Americans from their relative freedom from entangling political ties are the people best qualified to meet these needs. Our business men, and in its own special sphere our government, should hold themselves ready in each specific case anywhere in Europe to act promptly and wisely. How can we exert our influence to aid peace and prosperity most strongly and most wisely? We know far too little about Europe. Several important American business men and financiers have said to me within a year: "We do not know enough about Europe to invest safely. We will gladly join the English or the Dutch in investments in Germany or Austria or elsewhere. They understand the conditions, we do not." But if we are to play our fitting part in the world today, this ignorance must not continue. When we give financial help, we should not merely make a loan at a high rate with the thought of bringing home the interest and taking no active part in European affairs. We should directly help stricken Europe develop now, as prosperous Europe helped us develop our Middle West and build up our resources after our Civil War. As the president of one of our greatest banks said to me a few weeks ago: "It would be much better for both the foreign country concerned and for the peace of the world if Americans were to play an active part as stockholders in European companies, sharing in their management." If our people should place their own representatives in foreign establishments, we should then acquire a really first-hand knowledge of European conditions, and a large part of the present suspicion and distrust both of the Europeans themselves and of our own ability to enter safely into business relations with Europe, which spring from our ignorance, would inevitably disappear. We should then ably play our part in the recovery of Europe and the trend toward peace.

Speaking generally, the European countries today believe in the uprightness of American business men and in the desire both of our government and of our people not to attempt conquest anywhere or to dominate policies of any European government. This reputation is a good one and it has been fairly won. One of Turkey's leading statesmen said to me a short time before the Turkish re-occupation of Constantinople, "When an Italian or

Frenchman or even an Englishman asks for a concession or offers a loan or other financial help, we always ask ourselves: 'What is the political aim back of this?' When an American asks or offers, we do not fear political pressure. We are glad to give reasonable financial profit. That is all the American wants, and we can trust him." Yet we must in some definite way help in shaping certain European policies. The barriers between the countries, built up by fear and racial and religious prejudices, must be broken down. Removal of boundary restrictions must become general. Little ententes must become greater ones. The demands of business as well as of good politics and good morals require this. A growing business policy administered along modern lines in various European countries can exert great influence in bringing this about; and Americans, if capable business men are chosen to work in close harmony with Europe's wisest statesmen, can do this work best.

Incidentally this greater knowledge might well find its reflex influence in Congress, and there remove injurious restrictions and prevent annoying and troublesome resolutions and measures which often hamper and even at times discredit our foreign policy.

America's rôle in Europe is to be played by various actors: Business men, bankers, financiers, our consular and diplomatic representatives abroad (because aside from their official work they often exercise great influence through their personal relationship). In one time of stress some of our official economic experts as a friendly act, unofficially drafted a new tariff law for an ambitious, struggling, and inexperienced new government at that government's request. And the law was honestly, fairly drawn. It was a better law than one worked out by diplomatic agents before the war. That kind of righteous diplomacy pays.

Our government—Congress in its lawmaking capacity, the Executive in his dealings direct and indirect with the governments concerned, the great mass of the American citizens in the pressure that they bring to bear, wisely at times, most unwisely at other times, upon their representatives in the government—must all play their parts in this great world drama. While our government and our people should ever be watchful of American interests in their international relations, they should be even more watchful of themselves so as to avoid unnecessary and often most unjust expressions of opinion that tend to irritate and anger and wound the feelings of foreign nations. How often one is asked in Europe—in Asia, too—why it is that our people continue to manifest hostility toward certain foreign peoples. Why fight out in public addresses, even by resolutions in Congress, the Irish question, which is a British and not an American problem, but which nevertheless may seriously influence most important relations between Great Britain and America that will affect the welfare of all three countries concerned, Ireland as well as England and America? Why do great church conventions and reform organizations pass resolutions concerning the internal political or social conditions of European countries which will be cabled abroad and arouse feelings of resentment and hostility? Such acts, except in the rarest instances, cannot possibly do good, and they interfere with peaceful relations among the nations. It is a conservative estimate that nine out of ten of all the people who vote for such resolutions, of which the purpose is to bring pressure to bear upon our government or upon foreign governments, know nothing whatever about the question on which they are voting, but are influenced by a few interested even if well meaning partisans. We forget too often that on all these questions the President of the United States especially (but also through him and through their power of getting information officially, the members of Congress), has the most complete means of getting information of anyone in the country. Throughout all foreign countries the President has reporting to him daily men thoroughly trained in business, in governmental matters, in social questions. Moreover, the President and Congressmen have more vital interests in such matters than the average citizen, so that if they are left unimpeded in their action, they are far more likely to achieve the best results than if they are threatened with loss of their seats if they fail to follow the ignorant instructions of their uninformed constituents. Did Congressmen really wish to override the well informed opinion of President Coolidge and Secretary Hughes on Japanese exclusion—an opinion based on the well grounded policy of President Roosevelt—or were they influenced by the oratory and letters of less well informed constituents? A general law would have in fact kept out as many Japanese and would not have given the Japanese jingoes the excuse for turbulent—though sincere—outcries against America. And how about the bonus and tax bills? Is the welfare of all the people or the pressure of a specific class or party advantage the decisive influence? And which ought to dominate? I do not wish to be misunderstood as opposing the expression of opinion by constituents. We, the people, if alert as we should be, will endeavor to keep ourselves informed on political questions both domestic and foreign. We may well call the attention of our representatives to such matters, but we should be very cautious in urging by threats or other coercive measures a specific course of action upon our representatives on questions concerning which they can certainly be much better informed than most of us can possibly be. One of the greatest obstacles to intelligent direction, especially of international affairs, is the narrow-minded partisan pressure brought to bear upon our government on important but often delicate diplomatic questions. A most unfortunate feature of this process, as already said, is that the news of such action is invariably cabled abroad and does harm there, so that the wise action of our government is hampered.

I have called attention to the moral nature of the problems threatening European rehabilitation and progress. It must not be forgotten that America's influence in settling those issues is largely dependent upon our good reputation. We have now the reputation of not wishing as a government or as a people to meddle for selfish reasons in European politics. On the other hand, our reputation for good judgment and for intelligent and wise legislation has not always been enhanced by our laws. When we are attempting to increase our exports, some of the restrictive provisions of our tariff legislation seem very peculiar to intelligent European statesmen. They seem like attempts to sell without buying in exchange. If our influence abroad is to be the best, our legislation should be framed for mutual advantage. And I sometimes think we should hold an examination—a rigid one—of Americans proposing to travel abroad. American tourists, while often our best citizens, are sometimes our worst citizens and therefore do not make the best impression.

In our business methods, too, we should set an example to Europe of tolerance and fairmindedness. Some of our European rivals such as Great Britain and France, when making international loans, at times insist, as one of the conditions of the loan, that foreign supplies must be bought in the country of the lender. It is a satisfaction to know that when such a measure was suggested by an organization of our great business men, some of our bankers of wide international experience had the wise foresight to declare that the plan was shortsighted, that, whatever its immediate advantage, our best interests in the long run would be served in building up the country of the borrower through letting it satisfy its needs in the cheapest market. We should later receive our benefits from dealing with a more prosperous country. It is also a satisfaction to note that our government favored the wiser and more tolerant policy.

These, then, are the conditions; this, America's opportunity. Europe's needs are many, economic, financial, political, moral; and America only can satisfy these needs. Shall we not then strive for clarity of vision to see our opportunities exactly as they are? Let not our eyes be blinded by prejudice for or against any of the peoples in need, because of war relations or peace propaganda. By earnest effort and active participation in helpful work, public and private, let us replace our narrow ignorance with full knowledge. For the sake of an ultimate success, let us be ready to suffer, if need be, present inconvenience. While properly demanding safety and fair returns on investments, we should so conquer our ignorance that we can rely on our own judgment in placing loans in Europe or entering into active business relations there. Heretofore we have gone too fast at times. We should step carefully but without hesitation or delay in our next adventure.

Let us guard with scrupulous care our good reputation for not meddling in European politics for selfish American aggrandizement; but let us not hesitate, through cowardly fear or narrow partisan prejudice, to play our full part in helpful international movements looking toward the general welfare or the peace of the world. We were wise in not entering the League of Nations without such reservations as would enable us to guide independently our own destiny. We have been wise none the less in beginning our co-operation with the League on matters of world concern that cannot tie us up with purely European bickerings. Let us have wisdom enough to seize every opportunity for co-operation either with the League or outside it on matters of general world interest. Let us not be frightened by a word, whether that word be league or peace or even war. But neither let us be cajoled into sentimental or fanatical or unwise action by a word, whether that word be league or peace or war. And I sometimes think the danger of sentimentality is greater than that from fear.

We have noted a number of instances lately in connection with certain colleges or classes in reform organizations where young men and women were pledging themselves by the hundreds not to fight under any circumstances, even though our country should be invaded. Their motives are said to be Christian. Did you ever ask yourself what would have been the act of the Good Samaritan had he happened on the road to Jericho to encounter, while the conflict was still going on, the man who fell among thieves? Would he have felt it a neighborly act to stand idly by until the traveller was robbed and beaten down, bleeding and helpless by the roadside, in order that he might then bind up his wounds and take him to the neighboring inn? Or would he have felt it a more neighborly act to have attempted to rescue him from the robbers even at the risk of damage to himself? To my mind they are poor Christians, acting contrary to the spirit of Jesus' teachings, who carry their pacifist views to the extent of standing idly by while injustice and wrong are perpetrated.

Above all, let us remember that there are psychic forces at work in the world, things of the spirit, a moral order. In our dealings with others we too often forget their racial traits, their religion, their family and community customs, which are dearer to them though they may seem crude or foolish to us. They are to be overcome only by patience and education, if at all. More likely it is our task in reason no less than in morals to tolerate these differences and to work cordially with our fellowmen even when their ways are not as our ways. In this temper and with the spirit of unselfishness let us enter into closer relations in business and even in politics with our European brethren, not foolishly yielding to injustice or wrongdoing, but standing firmly for the right—even for our rights—with intelligent diplomacy, and if need be even with arms, when right and justice are at stake. But let us always keep in mind that our purpose is not cramped, not confined to our own selfish interests. It is broad enough to envisage the rights of others, to include the welfare of the world. Thus remembering, we shall play our rôle well and we shall do much to usher in the reign of righteousness and peace.

By permission of the author.

[It is interesting to note two years after this address was given that the business men and bankers of the United States, as well as the American Government, have followed the liberal policy indicated in the address.

The Dawes Plan two years ago was under consideration. It was adopted by Great Britain and France, and after a struggle by Germany. The results have been all that could have been anticipated, although it is as yet too early to know exactly how the Dawes Plan will work. Following its adoption large credits have been granted by our bankers to Germany and also to France, Poland, Hungary, and other countries. Besides these credits to the Governments, large credits to business concerns and large investments mounting on the whole into the hundreds of millions have been made. With these loans and investments of money have gone also good will and appreciation of Europe's needs.

While our Government has carefully refrained from any political entanglements, its spirit of good will and of helpfulness has also been shown. At the present writing it looks as if the American policy manifested in the Dawes Plan will work out slowly but surely the needed assistance for the rehabilitation of Europe.—J. W. J.]

THE THOROUGHBRED

V. H. STONE

V. H. Stone, of Lander, Wyoming, "where rails end and trails begin" (the official southern entrance to Yellowstone National Park), is a practising lawyer and a speaker of no little note throughout the West and middle West. His speech, couched in the racy picturesque English of the old frontiersman, bespeaks the man himself. It has been delivered successfully all over the United States.

PLACE our great utilities under Government ownership and you kill all incentive to excel, to use initiative, to develop ambition, invention, individualism; you create an army of time-servers, chair-warmers, clock-watchers. Did anyone with a secure position, drawing a regular salary and knowing that he could not be fired for indifference, carelessness, laziness, impudence or inattention, without going through a red-tape performance that would wear out the stoutest-hearted citizen, and leave his complaint unsettled until he died of senile debility, ever invent any useful or labor-saving device, ever advance any new idea, ever accomplish anything for the betterment of mankind? No.

These things have been accomplished by men and women who counted their days not by the hourhand on the clock, but by the results they obtain; men and women with a goal to be reached, a prize to attain, a reward to be earned; men and women who burned the midnight oil. If I am ready and willing to work twelve hours a day, and do work twelve hours a day, it is none of your business. If you are willing to work only six hours a day, and work but six hours a day, it is none of my business; but if I work twelve hours a day, and you work but six hours a day, it is none of your business if my wife and children wear better clothes, eat better food and live in a better house than your wife and children.

Permit me to quote just a few words recently written by that student of human nature, that man who has had a long and wonderful experience in observing the affairs of many peoples of the world, that brilliant scholar and philosopher, that dean of journalism, that most brilliant democrat this country ever produced—Henry Watterson—who said, "Individualism was the discovery of the fathers of the American republic. It is the bedrock of American philosophy."

There is a class of people who have made a failure of life from every standpoint, who imagine that they have discovered a cure-all for all the ills with which the body politic is threatened or afflicted. Armed with a Utopian pipe-dream, a magnificent set of lungs, and a pair of iron jaws, they preach a doctrine that would tear down those institutions which we have been building up in this country for five hundred years.

Whenever you so build the laws of a people that there is no incentive to excel, no reward held out for individual initiative, no prize offered for thrift, industry and economy, no object to be attained by doing things better than others do them, then you have cut the taproot through which flows the life-blood of progress, advancement, initiative, invention, individual effort and competition, and have settled back to a dead-level of sameness and stagnation that is incapable of making any material progress in social, physical, mental, or material matters; you have produced a common herd of scrubs.

The Thoroughbred is produced by careful thought, persistent effort, thorough training; by a desire to excel, to be in the forefront, to rise above the dead-level of mediocrity. The Thoroughbred wants to do better tomorrow than he did today; to accomplish more next year that he did this year. The Thoroughbred is willing to take a high leap, even though he knock off the top rail of the barrier and come a cropper. If he comes a cropper today he will go back and train and fit and practice and try again and again, until he clears the barrier, and has daylight left.

The scrub walks up to the barrier, takes a look, and says that it is too high; that it is useless to try; he has not the nerve to make an effort; he settles back into the pasture which is enclosed by the barrier and where the feed is short, tough and dry, and drags out a miserable existence on poor feed, poor shelter, poor care. His eye grows lack-luster, his coat poor and scanty, his ribs push through his hide. He curses his luck and bemoans his hard fate and the lack of those things which he says the world owes him.

The Thoroughbred has been willing to pay the price; he has denied himself; he has disciplined himself; he has worked while the scrub slept; he has sweated while the scrub lay in the shade; he has kept his muscles free and supple by grilling work and constant use; he has exercised his initiative, his invention, his pluck, his perseverance, his tenacity; he has fitted himself to succeed; he succeeds; he sails over the barrier like a bird, into a pasture where the feed is sweet and tender, the water pure and cool, the shade of the forest of success restful and invigorating.

The scrub looks through the slits in the barrier at the Thoroughbred, up to his knees in luxury and grass, whose eye sparkles, whose coat shines with a silken sheen, whose ribs are covered with sufficient meat to hide his bones. His eye shines with a malevolent light. The scrub says to himself, "It is unjust, unfair, inequitable; there is something wrong with a world that permits such conditions to exist."

And immediately the scrub sets about to devise ways and means, not to fit himself to clear the barrier, not to put himself in a condition where he can by his own effort acquire that which he desires, but to either hamstring the Thoroughbred who, by his pluck, perseverance and tenacity, his willingness to "pay with the body for the soul's desire," has reached his goal, or to destroy the pasture in which the Thoroughbred is enjoying the fruit of his endeavor.

The Thoroughbred recognizes that in order to *be,* he must *do.* The scrub refuses to *do,* and then curses the rest of the world because he cannot *be*. There is an abundance of feed and water and shelter in the Thoroughbred pasture for all.

Be a Thoroughbred; don't be a whiner. Try the barrier. If you knock the top rail off or the two top rails, keep on trying; keep on using your pluck, your perseverance, your tenacity, your individualism. Be a Thoroughbred or die a-trying. I'd rather *really live* while I live, and die at thirty, a Thoroughbred, than be a scrub Methuselah.

The Thoroughbred never quits while the heart beats, and the lungs perform their function. The scrub quits when he gets tired, and, if given the quirt and steel, lies down with the saddle on. You can usually tell the Thoroughbred by the expression of the eye, the motion of the nostrils, the carriage of the head; that individual something that the real judge recognizes but cannot quite describe in language.

The real race in life is not for the "quarter-hoss," the scrub; is calls for blood, for bottom, for nerve, for perfect condition, and, above all, for a cool, quiet courage, and an absolute self-confidence; a courage and a confidence that are not daunted because the other fellow gets away from the wire first, is ahead at the quarter, the half, the three-quarters. Almost every great race where the stakes were large has been run and won in the home stretch, under whip and spur, used with tact, judgment and courage, with the rider standing in his stirrups, reins wrapped round his hands, with every muscle like the strings of a tuned instrument; with his face in his horse's ears, rolling him with the energy of a dynamo at every jump; with the spurs drawing blood; the horse's eyes flashing, his sides heaving, his nostrils working like the exhaust from a pair of powerful bellows; with every muscle working as smoothly as the mechanism of a high-priced watch, and the heart-beat as true and regular as the tick of a clock. That's the Thoroughbred.

By permission of the author.

THE SIGNING OF AN ARMISTICE

WOODROW WILSON

Woodrow Wilson was the twenty-eighth President of the United States (1913–1921). He was born in Staunton, Virginia, in 1856, and died in the city of Washington in 1924. He was a graduate of Princeton and of the University of Virginia; a lawyer by profession; for many years a professor of jurisprudence and political economy at Bryn Mawr, and at Wesleyan and Princeton universities, and later President of Princeton University; and the author of books on the history, constitution, and government of the United States. In politics he was a democrat. His service as Governor of New Jersey was the immediate step to the Presidency. While President, and as head of the American Commission to Negotiate Peace, he was one of the signatories to the Treaty of Versailles in 1919.

This address was read before Congress at noon, November 11, 1918, as the President's official communication to both Houses that an armistice had been signed by the opposing forces of the World War.

THE German authorities, who have at the invitation of the Supreme War Council been in communication with Marshal Foch, have accepted and signed the terms of armistice which he was authorized and instructed to communicate to them. . . .

The war thus comes to an end; for, having accepted these terms of armistice, it will be impossible for the German command to renew it.

It is not now possible to assess the consequences of this great consummation. We know only that this tragical war . . . is at an end. . . . We know, too, that the object of the war is attained; the object upon which all free men had set their hearts; and attained with a sweeping completeness which even now we do not realize. . . .

There is no longer conjecture as to the objects the victors have in mind. They have a mind in the matter, not only, but a heart also. Their avowed and concerted purpose is to satisfy and protect the weak as well as to accord their just rights to the strong. . . .

The present and all that it holds belongs to the nations and the peoples who preserve their self-control and the orderly processes of their Governments; the future to those who prove themselves the true friends of mankind. To conquer with arms is to make only a temporary conquest; to conquer the world by earning its esteem is to make permanent conquest. I am confident that the nations that have learned the discipline of freedom and that have settled with self-possession to its ordered practice are now about to make conquest of the world by the sheer power of example and of friendly helpfulness.

The peoples who have but just come out from under the yoke of arbitrary government and who are now coming at last into their freedom will never find the treasures of liberty they are in search of if they look for them by the light of the torch. They will find that every pathway that is stained with the blood of their brothers leads to the wilderness, not to the seat of their hope. They are now face to face with their initial test. We must hold the light steady until they find themselves. And in the meantime, if it be possible, we must establish a peace that will justly define their place among the nations, remove all fear of their neighbors and of their former masters, and enable them to live in security and contentment when they have set their own affairs in order. I, for one, do not doubt their purpose or their capacity. There are some happy signs that they know and will choose the way of self-control and peaceful accommodation. If they do, we shall put our aid at their disposal in every way that we can. If they do not, we must await with patience and sympathy the awakening and recovery that will assuredly come at last.

From *The Congressional Record.*

RESPONSIBILITIES OF CITIZENSHIP

JAMES C. CROPSEY

James Church Cropsey, justice of the Supreme Court of the State of New York for the term 1916–'30, has been active in legal affairs since 1893, when he received an LL.B. from Columbia University and was admitted to the bar.

Justice Cropsey delivered this address at the annual meeting of the American Bankers' Association, held at Chicago, October, 1924.

ARE you satisfied with the way generally that the young people of this day are growing up? Do you believe they are in the main giving the best of which they are capable in their acts as citizens?

There are things happening every day in all parts of the country which attract attention, particularly one of the serious conditions of this country, and that is to the youth and the prevalence of crime among the youthful.

Figures tell us that over 80 per cent of all those who commit crimes are under twenty-five years of age, and 95 per cent of those are boys or young men. And, of course, as bad as that is, and as great as is that number in total throughout these United States, perhaps the problem would not be so bad if they were the only ones who were not leading the right kind of lives. But the fact is that for every young man or boy who commits a crime and is convicted there are many times that number who commit crimes who are never convicted; many because they are acquitted, although guilty, and many others because they are never apprehended. And if we even left it at that, still the conditions would be nothing like as bad as they really are.

But there are still hundreds of thousands of them who commit no crime, at least in the sense that they do not commit a violation of statute law which renders them liable to criminal punishment, but who are not living up to what their ideals of life should be, and are failing to become and be the citizens they ought to be in this great Republic.

If you think that the great vote that is sometimes called the radical vote is composed in the main of people who were born abroad, I think you are quite in error. I am perfectly satisfied that the great bulk of the so-called radical vote in New York City is not from foreign born voters at all. The great bulk of the strength of that vote is from the young men who were born in this country and the bulk of them born in the city of New York. Yet they have the idea that government was created for their benefit; yes, if they had the right idea of that it would be all right, but they have the idea that government was created for their benefit so that it would give them a living, that it owes them a living, and that all they can get out of the government is so much the better for them, without feeling any responsibility of rendering anything or giving anything in return to the government.

My thought is addressed to the boy before he gets to be a voter. It is hard to change a man after he has got into habits; it is no easy thing to make him give up the customs that he has grown into, so I think we have got to approach the problem by treating the boy before he becomes a man, the boy in that age of transition, between the time that he is a boy and the time that he becomes a man, and that usually happens between the ages of twelve and eighteen. Today he is a boy and tomorrow he is a man, and unless he is caught at that time in his life, the chance of molding him into what he ought to be is not as great.

Well, what is the proposition about this? Do you think there is any need of something being done for the young man of today? Secondly, if you think there is a need, have you any idea of how it can be approached so as to succeed in accomplishing something? I do not think that what I would suggest is either original, nor is it the only way in which the thing can be done, but I know that a great deal has been accomplished for the boy, and I am sure that a lot more can be accomplished if we can only get the men of this great country interested in the proposition.

"What are we going to do to meet this boy proposition?" I once asked a minister and he said, "Why, of course, the way to attack it, the way to approach it is by getting them into the church."

And I said, "Very well, I will agree with you that if you can get them into the church the problem is solved—no particular church, I would not care whether it was the Catholic, Protestant or the Jewish faith, if you can get a boy into the church and keep him under the influence of religion, your problem is absolutely solved, and that is a fact that is established."

That fact is established, so far as the commission of crime goes, by the statistics for many, many years past. Speaking only of the period within my own personal observation and the experience of 12 years, the fact is that of the thousands and tens of thousands of boys who have come before me or who are under my notice, who have been convicted of crime, there has never been one who was at the time the crime was committed going regularly either to church or Sunday school. A number of them had gone to Sunday school at some time in the past; some of them had gone to church at some time in the past, but there was not a single one who at the time was under the influence that comes from religion, from regular attendance at a church or at Sunday school.

And why do they not go to Sabbath school if they have already gone? I have asked that question of hundreds of boys of sixteen, seventeen or eighteen years. And this was the answer I got, "Why, I am too big to go to Sunday school."

That means that he having come to that transition period in his life when he has ceased to be a boy and has become a man, he has the abnormal idea that he cannot associate with anybody but men and that if he goes with boys or goes with women or girls, he is not living up to what he ought to be. He has to be with the men because he feels that he is a man.

And the reason that boys do not go to Sunday school in my part of the country, at least, of which I can speak because I have been to a great many of them and know, is because we men do not go to Sunday school, and that is the absolutely true answer to it.

Of course, if you can get them under the influence of religion I am perfectly satisfied that you are going to produce the desired result because there is no power or agency or influence in the world commensurate with the power and influence of religion in bringing up all kinds of people.

What are you going to do to approach this problem if you cannot get them under the influence of religion? Are we going to say, "Well, we have done all we can? We have paid our money and we have created these churches or these public centers? We are keeping them going by the expenditure of our funds and that is all we can do?"

My feeling is that we are not doing our full duty in merely doing that. My feeling is that we men owe a tremendous responsibility and that we owe a corresponding duty to meet this problem in a practical way—and it can be met in a practical way. This is not something that you can do with money. My appeal is not along those lines at all. You cannot buy what I want to make an appeal to you to give. You cannot give money as a substitute for it.

It is service that is needed, personal service—the service that comes from your heart and not from your purse, the service that comes first from a realization that there is a duty to perform, that there is a need for the performance of it and then the response that comes from your conscience that you ought to be doing something to help it along.

That is the reason I said it cannot be bought. That is the reason I said it is not the equivalent of money. I am asking the men to give some of their time, something that is of their very innermost personality because I am asking the men to take a personal interest in this and give something of themselves.

"Well," you say, "what good will that do? How will that improve the boys? Supposing we are willing to give something of our time? How can we give it and what good will it do?"

About six months ago there was published in some of our magazines an article which contained statistics. They pointed out, it seemed to me, absolutely just what is accomplished by the influence of men. This article contained tables showing tests that had been applied to different groups of boys (and girls, too) between the ages of twelve and eighteen, most of them between the ages of twelve and sixteen. They were asked a number of questions. One of them was something like this:

"Is it just as bad to steal from a railroad company as to steal from an individual?" Of course, they might just as well have transposed that, for the purpose of banking, and said: "Is it just as bad to steal from the bank as it is from an individual?"

One other question that I have in mind is, "If you went to a store and made a purchase and gave the storekeeper a piece of money which was more than the amount of your purchase and he gave you in change more than you were entitled to, would you keep the extra money that was not yours or would you give it back to the storekeeper?"

There were five or six or maybe a dozen other questions on those same general lines, to show whether the boy or girl was thinking right, whether he was honest in his heart or whether his idea was to see how much he could get out of life and whether he had any idea of responsibility that he owed to other people.

The last question about the money was answered by 64 per cent of them saying that they would keep the money and would not return it at all, although they knew they got too much.

The result of the whole examination was that the lowest group had a percentage of right answers of fifty-six.

Who was that lowest group of boys? They were the average boy of today. They were public school boys.

Well, we go up in the list and there was a group that had a little higher percentage and still another group that had a higher percentage. So we go on to the top group. The top group of the eight or ten had a percentage of eighty-two.

What was that group? That was another group of the average boy. It was a group of public school boys. The difference between the two groups was just this. The group of 56 per cent right was a group that was not under (except in the sense that every schoolboy is under some man's or woman's leadership) the leadership of any man; it did not have the benefit of a man's ideas and of a man's ideals; and it did not know how the right kind of men were living.

What was the influence surrounding the group that had 82 per cent right? Public school boys—yes. But they were public school boys plus something else, and that "plus" made just the difference between fifty-six and eighty-two. The "plus" was the influence of a red-blooded man, who had taken charge of that group of boys and had acted as their leader and their guide in the work of the Boy Scouts, most of them for two years.

And the article said that probably the percentage would have been higher yet but for the fact that in that group, while most of those boys had been under the influence of their leader for two years, there were a few who had come in only recently and who had not had the benefit of his leadership for any length of time. It said that that probably made the percentage only eighty-two and that otherwise it would have been much higher.

If you took all the intermediate groups which this speech sets forth you would see the same thing applicable. The group that had the leadership of a man was the group that had the better showing.

You may believe that it is impossible for an influence of a man to do any good to a boy merely by being with him, but if you ever tried it you would be satisfied that you were wrong. It not only is possible but it has been demonstrated in hundreds and hundreds of cases. I do not mean that you preach to the boys. That is not the thought at all. You cannot preach to the boys and get the best results.

All that is expected and all that is wanted and the thing that brings the best results is not to try to preach to them, but just to be with them and let yourself be reflected in what you do and in what you say, and then you will find that they take hold of that and try to pattern their lives after it.

No doubt many, many of you have boys. If you have, I think you have found out before this that every boy is a hero worshipper. He is tying himself onto somebody whom he has picked as his hero, and whether it shall be the right kind of a leader who shall be his hero or the wrong kind of a leader is the thing over which we men have a whole lot of control.

Shall we let them go out on the corners and into the pool rooms and other places that are perhaps as bad and there try to find their heroes? We know what kind of heroes they find there. We know that they find there the "hero" who leads them into wrong. Or shall we try to gather them into some place where we can get them and have some good man look after them, and there try to let that man show what he is and win their confidence and then their esteem and so become their hero?

If we could get our young men to be the kind of citizens they ought to be and could reach them in their period of development, we would have a country in which the idea of patriotism would not exist merely in time of war, but in which the idea of true patriotism would exist at all times; we would have a country in which the boys and the young men would realize that it was quite as patriotic to be thinking of their government and of their duties as citizens when our country was at peace as it was to be willing to offer their lives when the country might be at war. Too many of our young men think that the only time to show patriotism is when we are at war. Of course, the time to show patriotism is equally great when we are at peace.

This then is a problem that is not local. It is not confined to any section of the country. Every section has the same problem knocking at its door. If you have not looked into it, you do not know probably the condition that exists in your section. I happen to know the condition that exists in New York, and I have no doubt in the world that a similar condition exists everywhere else.

I hope an appeal may be made some time and some place by somebody which will reach the hearts of the great body of men of this land of ours so that when the boys knock on the door and ask for a man as their leader they will not have to be told that the manhood of America is not willing to respond to the call.

I hope the time will come when men's consciences will be stirred to the extent of being willing to render that additional service to their country, a service to the boyhood of America to make it a better manhood, a service which will not only make the boys better and so the country better, but a service which when once rendered by the men will fill them with an experience that perhaps they have never had before and which will make their hearts throb and their blood circulate with a greater rapidity and with a thrilling throb that will make them realize that their service on this earth, as good as it may have been in the past, has yet never reached the height that it has reached when they are now giving of themselves in their service for mankind. The man who does it will find the return that can come from nothing else in the world commensurate with it, the return that no money or compensation of that kind can ever possibly begin to pay for, the return of a consciousness of a service rendered, not for self, but a service rendered others, for the good of mankind.

From *The American Bankers Association Journal.* By permission of the author.

TO THE STATE SENATE ON BEING ELECTED ITS PRESIDENT, JANUARY 7, 1924

CALVIN COOLIDGE

Calvin Coolidge, thirtieth president of the United States, was born in Plymouth, Vermont, in 1872. He was graduated from Amherst College, practised law, entered the Massachusetts legislature, was elected Mayor of Boston, then Governor of Massachusetts (1919–'21). In 1920 he was elected Vice-President of the United States, and succeeded to the Presidency upon the death of President Harding in the summer of 1923. Mr. Coolidge was elected President in 1924, serving until 1928.

In this speech before the Massachusetts Senate, he has outlined his ideas of our government.

HONORABLE SENATORS:—I thank you—with gratitude for the high honor given, with appreciation for the solemn obligations assumed—I thank you.

This Commonwealth is one. We are all members of one body. The welfare of the weakest and the welfare of the most powerful are inseparably bound together. Industry cannot flourish if labor languish. Transportation cannot prosper if manufactures decline. The general welfare cannot be provided for in any one act, but it is well to remember that the benefit of one is the benefit of all, and the neglect of one is the neglect of all. The suspension of one man's dividends is the suspension of another man's pay envelope.

Men do not make laws. They do but discover them. Laws must be justified by something more than the will of the majority. They must rest on the eternal foundation of righteousness. That state is most fortunate in its form of government which has the aptest instruments for the discovery of laws. The latest, most modern, and nearest perfect system that statesmanship has devised is representative government. Its weakness is the weakness of us imperfect human beings who administer it. Its strength is that even such administration secures to the people more blessings than any other system ever produced. No nation has discarded it and retained liberty. Representative government must be preserved.

Courts are established, not to determine the popularity of a cause, but to adjudicate and enforce rights. No litigant should be required to submit his case to the hazard and expense of a political campaign. No judge should be required to seek or receive political rewards. The courts of Massachusetts are known and honored wherever men love justice. Let their glory suffer no diminution at our hands. The electorate and judiciary cannot combine. A hearing means a hearing. When the trial of causes goes outside the court-room, Anglo-Saxon constitutional government ends.

The people cannot look to legislation generally for success. Industry, thrift, character, are not conferred by act or resolve. Government cannot relieve from toil. It can provide no substitute for the rewards of service. It can, of course, care for the defective and recognize distinguished merit. The normal must care for themselves. Self-government means self-support.

Man is born into the universe with a personality that is his own. He has a right that is founded upon the constitution of the universe to have property that is his own. Ultimately, property rights and personal rights are the same thing. The one cannot be preserved if the other be violated. Each man is entitled to his rights and the rewards of his service be they never so large or never so small.

History reveals no civilized people among whom there were not a highly educated class, and large aggregations of wealth, represented usually by the clergy and the nobility. Inspiration has always come from above. Diffusion of learning has come down from the university to the common school—the kindergarten is last. No one would now expect to aid the common school by abolishing higher education.

It may be that the diffusion of wealth works in an analogous way. As the little red schoolhouse is builded in the college, it may be that the fostering and protection of large aggregations of wealth are the only foundation on which to build the prosperity of the whole people. Large profits mean large payrolls. But profits must be the result of service performed. In no land are there so many and such large aggregations of wealth as here; in no land do they perform larger service; in no land will the work of a day bring so large a reward in material and spiritual welfare.

Have faith in Massachusetts. In some unimportant detail some other States may surpass her, but in the general results, there is no place on earth where the people secure, in a larger measure, the blessings of organized government, and nowhere can those functions more properly be termed self-government.

Do the day's work. If it be to protect the rights of the weak, whoever objects, do it. If it be to help a powerful corporation better to serve the people, whatever the opposition, do that. Expect to be called a stand-patter, but don't be a stand-patter. Expect to be called a demagogue, but don't be a demagogue. Don't hesitate to be as revolutionary as science. Don't hesitate to be as reactionary as the multiplication table. Don't expect to build up the weak by pulling down the strong. Don't hurry to legislate. Give administration a chance to catch up with legislation.

We need a broader, firmer, deeper faith in the people—a faith that men desire to do right, that the Commonwealth is founded upon a righteousness which will endure, a reconstructed faith that the final approval of the people is given not to demagogues, slavishly pandering to their selfishness, merchandising with the clamor of the hour, but to statesmen, ministering to their welfare, representing their deep, silent, abiding convictions.

Statutes must appeal to more than material welfare. Wages won't satisfy, be they ever so large. Nor houses; nor lands; nor coupons, though they fall thick as the leaves of autumn. Man has a spiritual nature. Touch it, and it must respond as the magnet responds to the pole. To that, not to selfishness, let the laws of the Commonwealth appeal. Recognize the immortal worth and dignity of man. Let the laws of Massachusetts proclaim to her humblest citizen, performing the most menial task, the recognition of his manhood, the recognition that all men are peers, the humblest with the most exalted, the recognition that all work is glorified. Such is the path to equality before the law. Such is the foundation of liberty under the law. Such is the sublime revelation of man's relation to man—Democracy.

From *Have Faith in Massachusetts*, by permission of and by arrangement with Houghton Mifflin Company, the authorized publishers.

PART IV

Speeches that clearly are in touch with the audience throughout. These are distinctly speeches as distinguished from essays.

COMMENCEMENT ADDRESS

WILLIAM LYON PHELPS

William Lyon Phelps, Lampson Professor of English Literature at Yale University, noted author, editor, and lecturer, was born in New Haven, Connecticut, January 2, 1865. He received his A.B. from Yale in 1887 and his PH.D. in 1891. His A.M. degree was secured at Harvard University. The recipient of the honorary degree of LITT.D. from Brown University and Colgate University is also President of the New Haven Symphony Orchestra and the New Haven Literary Guild. The commencement address given here was delivered by Mr. Phelps to the graduating class of New York University, June 8, 1927.

MR. CHANCELLOR, MR. SECRETARY, LADIES AND GENTLEMEN—I will not say, My Constituents, but My Classmates:

I can't tell you how honored I feel to be here today, a graduate of New York University, and to be associated with you in front of me in receiving a degree from this institution, and I am very much pleased to see that my speech comes between two of my favorite operas, the opera *Mignon* and the opera *Lohengrin,* which will relieve you in a short time.

And speaking of music, may I say that while I am immensely honored in being associated with those who are to receive honorary degrees today, I especially congratulate New York University in giving a degree to the youngest of us and to one of your own men, Deems Taylor. Deems Taylor is an American who has written a grand opera that people who have heard once actually want to hear again. And by that opera he has placed himself among the foremost living composers.

Now I want to talk to you today for a short time on three words—accuracy, loyalty, and art. You see that those are three aspects of the word "truth," and whatever may be the motto of a university, its purpose in all its branches is to discover, elucidate, and uphold the truth; and that is just as true of works of art as it is of experimental work in laboratories.

Accuracy is not all there is to truth. Many of you will find when you get out into the world that you will be sorely perplexed in times of stress and emergency to steer a right course with accuracy on one hand and loyalty on the other. You can be accurate and you can be disloyal. The old story of the lady who prided herself on always being sincere, which means, of course, being particularly disagreeable, and the lady who prided herself on saying things that put other people at their ease, which meant that she was an angel, came into conflict once. Mrs. Brown said to Mrs. Jones, "How beautifully your gown fits. You do wear the most becoming things." And the other lady pulled a long face and said, "I wish I could say the same of you." And she said, "Why, you could if you lied the way I did."

Now there are certain people who have a passion for accuracy who ought to remember Mark Twain's statement that often the surest way to convey misinformation is to tell the exact truth.

We know the history of the great sailing ship that was far away in the Indian Ocean. The ship was in a calm and all the men were desperate and the mate got drunk for the first and only time in his life, and the captain kept the log that week and he wrote in the log, "Mate was drunk yesterday," and when the mate came to he said, "Now, captain, you must take off that statement from the log; that will ruin me." The captain said, "It is true. You were drunk yesterday." "I was, but I shall not get a berth again when we come to port and you must forgive me and take it out." The captain said, "No, I believe in writing the exact truth." "Very well," said the mate. A week later the mate was keeping the log and he wrote in it, "Captain was sober yesterday."

Now there are two kinds of people, people who believe in absolute accuracy and people who are loyal by nature. Loyalty is a virtue as well as accuracy. From the times of Ruth, who followed her mother-in-law, we have splendid examples of loyalty.

There is a fine passage in one of Shakespeare's least known plays, one of the three parts of *Henry the Sixth*, when the wobbling Henry sat on a wobbling throne and a confused and turbulent gang of chieftains stood in front of him and some of them half-heartedly supported him and some of them denounced him; and then stepped forward Lord Clifford and said, "King Henry, be thy title right or wrong, Lord Clifford vows to fight in thy defence." And I have often thought, across the years, how reassuring those words from the strong man, who knew what he wanted and who knew whom he served, came to the ears of that king.

Certain types of mind in times of great national stress and difficulties will prefer the exact truth and other types of mind will prefer loyalty, and all I can hope is that you will not be in such cruel perplexity at such times that your honesty and your loyalty will put you in a position where you will not be able to make any move at all.

Life is full of difficult problems. There is no theory of life that will fit all the facts. There is no program that can be prepared in advance that will get you neatly out of every difficulty, but if a man has in his heart the love of truth, the love of accuracy, and if he has devotion and loyalty to ideals and to noble things, he is far more apt to serve his country and aid mankind than if he does not have those qualities.

We know in the familiar advice of Polonius to Laertes, which is, I think, very much like stagnant water, (Coleridge said, you know, that Polonius was the personification of the memory of wisdom no longer possessed), Polonius said to his son, "To thine own self be true and it must follow, as the night the day, thou canst not then be false to any man." But such advice was folly, and Laertes, being a fool, followed it and, instead of the fact that he was true to himself making him true to others, it made him a traitor and a murderer. You all know perfectly well that being true does not mean being true to oneself, but being true to an ideal. The carpenter is not true to himself, the architect is not true to himself, the sea captain is not true to himself—they always have an ideal; they always have some thing that is perfect to which they try to live up, and I think very often many of our difficulties today arise from the fact that many persons wish to trim the ideal to suit human convenience, instead of jacking up human convenience to approach the ideal.

But besides the truth of accuracy and the truth of loyalty, both great virtues, there is also the truth of art. If I had to draw a distinction today between science, of which I know nothing, and art, of which I am a humble admirer, I would say that science is the most romantic thing in the world and art is the most truthful thing in the world. If I were teaching science today, which God forbid, because I don't know anything about it—when I was a little boy at school the teacher said to me, "Willie, in mathematics you are slow but not sure." You all know that if one were teaching mathematics and everyone in the room had a certain problem to finish and hand in there would be only one answer to that problem, and if someone should say, "But I think I have the right answer," the very words "I think" are ridiculous and self-contradictory in mathematics. You must not think in mathematics. You cannot have an opinion in mathematics. You can have an opinion about the character of Woodrow Wilson or an opinion about the Catholic Church or an opinion about the League of Nations and, whatever opinion you have, you will find people just as able as you are who hold the opposite opinion, and thus you have good ground for debate. But you can't have an opinion about mathematics or engineering and if another person should say, "Well, I got it almost right," that would be equally ridiculous. It would be wonderful, wouldn't it, to build a bridge across the Hudson and get it *almost* right? But the person who has the right answer is right and every person who agrees with that person is right, and every person who disagrees, no matter how amiable his character may be, and no matter how fine his ancestry, and no matter how good his opinions may be, is wrong, and in these days of fluent inaccuracy when everyone expresses an authoritative opinion on subjects of which he knows nothing, it is rather fine to remember that there is a chaste beauty about mathematics. There is a noble beauty about pure science. A German playwright said the mathematician was like a man who lived in a glass house on top of a mountain covered with eternal snow. It was cold and it was lonely, but it was pure.

Now, how different is the case, how totally different is the case when you come to literature. If I ask a certain person, "What do you think of the works of a popular novelist?" and he says, "I think those works are magnificent; they uplift me, I feel thrilled by them," and you ask another person what he thinks about them and he says, "Those works make me physically sick," I ask which is right, and I answer both are absolutely right. You say, "Can two hold irreconcilable opinions in art and both be right?" and the answer is yes. Didn't you say that you felt uplifted by that book by that novelist? Yes. Then he is an uplifting and ennobling writer. And didn't *you* say that that writer made you sick? Then he is a disgusting writer. The same writer then is ennobling and disgusting and he is that at the same time and with the same material. There is a certain charm about the individuality of art. It is like going into a great garden and wandering whither you will, selecting flowers. Take for example the rose and the lily. I mention those two because those are the only two flowers that I know by sight. I am familiar with the names of others from my reading, but I am quite sure that all these novelists who have in their novels what I call the botanical opening get that from their wives.

Now suppose you take the rose and lily, and you want to decide which is the better flower. Don't come to me, but go to a professor of botany. He can't tell you. He doesn't know. Don't you see, there is no umpire there. There is no person to say which is better, the rose or the lily. There is that individuality in art, it is a republic, an absolute democracy where every person when he gives an opinion, although the opinion may have no objective value, has the value of self-revelation. It shows at any rate what you like, for the old statement, ridiculing people who know what they like, is not really ridiculous at all, properly considered. A person who knows what he likes is an unusual person and a person who can state a good reason for what he likes is extraordinarily rare. On the other hand, when you come to the romance of science, we are now living, you and I, in the most romantic age that the world has ever seen. Don't let anyone ever convince you that this is a gross or materialistic or a flat or an uninteresting age. You young men and women ought to thank God that you are alive today and for the miracles you will see in the next fifty years. Those miracles we owe to science.

When people talk about the wonders of the Middle Ages and the stories of the *Arabian Nights,* they ought to remember that there is a deaf, white-haired old gentleman, living in New Jersey, by the name of Edison, who is a far greater magician than Merlin ever was, than any of the genii of the *Arabian Nights.* We ought to remember that those people who lived in the Middle Ages would have given all they possessed to see the things and hear the things and know the things that have become almost commonplaces today. Not only that, but modern science has overcome apparently insuperable obstacles. It is a misfortune to be blind, but not when you are hearing the radio; then you are just as well off as anybody else. It is a misfortune to be deaf but not when you are at the motion pictures; then it is a great advantage. It is a misfortune to have only one leg, but not when you are in a Ford car; then you travel just as fast as anybody.

Not only has science brought to pass the most amazing wonders, wonders that were undreamed of in the so-called romantic periods of history, but we beat those magicians at their own game. Let me give one illustration: Everybody knows the story of the sleeping princess, the enchanted castle, how the beautiful girl slept for one hundred years, and all the family slept, and then Prince Charming came and, at the moment that he kissed the girl, not only did she wake up, but her father woke up, pots and pans rattled in the kitchen, footsteps were running up and down the stairs, fountains leaped up into the air and all the castle woke from a sleep of a century. But a few years ago, the President of the United States sat in Washington and leaned forward and touched a button on the desk, a contact like the kiss, and the moment that he touched the button, rocks away yonder in Panama woke up not from a sleep of one hundred years but from a sleep of forty thousand years; they burst asunder, fountains leaped up into the air and all the wonder and power of a great highway of commerce was opened to the world. That is the way we wake them up today, and we owe all that to science. And yet, finally, science is never so true as fiction. Science is never so true as art. If any one of your professors should say to you, "I am going to teach you chemistry and I will use a book published in 1875," you would all laugh at him. You say, "Why, didn't the man who wrote that mean to tell the truth? Wasn't he a famous chemist?" "Certainly, but, Professor, if he were alive today he would have to rewrite the whole book." "How do you mean? Do you mean that science which was true some years ago is not true today?" You mean exactly that. Be sure, my dear friends and classmates, whenever you buy a work of science, be sure and get the latest edition. It is very important. But whenever you buy a work of literature be sure you get the earliest edition that you can. Charles Darwin was a man of genius whom we all hold in honor. Charles Dickens, his contemporary, was a man of genius, whom we all hold in honor. But if Darwin were alive today he would have to rewrite many pages of his own books; and if Dickens were alive today he wouldn't have to touch a line in *David Copperfield*.

Once, not long ago, in the open air, in a great stadium, I heard a play written by Euripides, written over four hundred years before Christ; and when it came to the recognition scene, in the last act, the twentieth century audience burst into tears. What were they crying at? They were crying at immortal truth, at truth that never changes. Science is founded, with all its wonder and romance, on shifting and strange foundations. It is forever in flux. The science of yesterday is not the science of tomorrow, but the great works of fiction, the works of Euripides and Shakespeare and Dickens are founded on something immutable, unchangeable —human nature.

There is only one man in the world who thinks human nature is going to change and that is Mr. H. G. Wells. Someone has said that he lies awake at night and hears Mr. Wells changing his own mind. Now Wells himself is a man of genius and he is unique in many respects, but especially in that. Human nature will never change. The same instincts that people had, they have today. The one thing we hope for is that in the future, by education, by universal education, by higher education and by the grace of God, people will get so that they can control these instincts. You have exactly the same instincts sitting here now and looking so civilized and dignified, you have exactly the same instincts that people had forty thousand years ago when they chased each other with an ax. The only reason I can speak to you with impunity is because you control those instincts.

Finally let me say one more word to you: Love accuracy, love loyalty, love romance, love human nature, but, above all, love life itself. Be loyal to life. The disease of today is the fear of life. You ought to love life, and the way to love it is to begin every day of your lives as though it were the first day and the last day that you had on earth. Life may have trouble for you and disappointment and moments of agony, frustration, and despair, but life is the most interesting thing we know. The truth is more interesting than anything else and, if you can learn this one secret, never to do anything mechanically . . . I learned that of a young boy in a haberdashery shop on Fifth Avenue and if you don't think it is undignified (I think myself that nothing is undignified that is truth) I will tell you about it. I walked along Fifth Avenue one day and stepped into a haberdashery shop. I wanted to buy a pair of socks. Why I wanted to buy only one pair wouldn't interest you. But as I entered, a boy of perhaps seventeen came forward and said, "What can I do for you, sir?" I said, "I want to buy a pair of socks." And he said, "Do you know that you have come to the greatest store in the world to buy socks?" I said, "No, but I am glad to hear it." He said, "Let me show you these things," and he began pulling them out and I said, "Hold on, I am going to buy only one pair." "Oh, I know, but I want you to see how beautiful they are!" His eyes glowed, socks was his religion. I became far more interested in him than I did in the socks and I said, "My boy, if you can keep this up, if this isn't an initial spurt of enthusiasm owing to novelty, but is part of your nature and personality, in ten years you will own every sock in the United States." Now that boy taught the professor a great lesson. The way to failure is always through mechanical routine. The minister, the lawyer, the businessman, the engineer, anyone you like, who begins life with an initial spurt and loses that and begins to think that life is ordinary and commonplace, very soon becomes mechanical and then becomes incompetent and then becomes sour and then he is a failure. Life is too big a thing; it is the greatest of all the arts!

I welcome you into the beginning of what ought to be a mighty daily experience.

By permission of the author.

OUR COMMISSION

DAVID LLOYD GEORGE

David Lloyd George, Prime Minister and First Lord of the Treasury of Great Britain, 1916–'22, had been a member of Parliament from Carnarvon, Wales, since 1890, and successively President of the Board of Trade, Chancellor of the Exchequer, Minister of Munitions, and Secretary of State for War.

The speech quoted here was made in New York in 1923, at a farewell dinner given in his honor.

Mr. Chairman, Ladies and Gentlemen: I thank you, sir, for your very kind and indulgent introduction. I thank Mr. Davis for his much too flattering observations about myself. He and I worked in close association and, may I say, in friendship while he was Ambassador to our country.

One of those political changes that will occur in democratic countries and for which we are not all of us responsible, made it necessary for him to recross the Atlantic, and that gives me the advantage of renewing my acquaintance with him and my friendship on American soil.

I want to thank you who are present for coming here to bid me a courteous farewell on my leaving your hospitable shores. I want to thank the very considerable number who were anxious to come here; and through the instrumentality of this mechanism the acquaintance of which I have made, I think, for the first time on this side of the Atlantic, I wish to thank my invisible audience for the warmth of their reception in the various parts of the country which I have visited.

I leave this land with regret. I leave it filled with gratitude for the great kindness, great cordiality, great hospitality, which has gone to my heart. I thank you all.

Mr. Davis rather reproached me for not having visited this great land before. I plead guilty. I feel I ought to have, and it was my intention to do so, but during the last fifteen or sixteen years I have been so occupied by affairs on the other side that, although there are a good many there who would have been very glad to see me go, and to have antedated this visit, and who could have easily spared me. I did not share their point of view.

I have traveled in the course of the month I have been on this side of the Atlantic some thousands of miles in Canada and in the United States of America, and my first, and I think my deepest impression is the vastness of these two great countries, countries of infinite resources and of endless possibilities. There was an old Welsh peasant who had lived inland all his life and had a very hard time of it on his small farm, who, in his old age, came for the first time to the seaside, and when he saw the sea he said, "Thank God for something of which there seems to be plenty."

I had that feeling in crossing your plains and prairies. It is a gigantic country, with possibilities which are beyond the dreams of men. May I say that one thing has—I will not say surprised me, but has given me great delight—and that is the great beauty of your country in its autumn robes. I had heard of the grandeur of the Far West, but I had no idea that the Eastern portions of Canada and of the United States of America were so beautiful, and certainly not as beautiful as they are at this time of the year. The profuseness, the variety, the brilliance of coloring—the oak and the maple, clad in splendor, even little shrubs, the mere weeds of the wilderness, arrayed in radiant glory. I felt that the great King must be holding his autumnal court in the great forests of the West. It is a beautiful sight, and one I shall never forget.

I came here to address eight meetings—I believe this is my seventieth. It is not in mortal man to deliver seventy speeches without saying something for which he is sorry, and I have known men who were not able to deliver one speech without committing an indiscretion for which, if not they, a good many other people were sorry; and if I have said anything in the course of these numerous speeches that is apart from the strict rules, that has given offense, to any one, that has transgressed any of your party controversies—well, please put it down to my ignorance and pass it over.

I did not willingly trespass. The frontiers between parties are not always very clearly marked and I may have missed the posts now and again, but I did not deliberately introduce contretemps. I came on no mission, but being asked to speak I have spoken frankly. I have spoken what I believe. I have spoken what I am convinced of. I have seen a suggestion that I was in collusion with Lord Curzon in something which I said. Well, I haven't the honor of having any consultation or communication or previous arrangement with Lord Curzon. I am a member of no Government. I am simply a private citizen. But in the things I have said I had a certain sense of personal responsibility, having regard to the part which I had played in the war and in the making of the peace.

We have all had our responsibility. During the War I stood for the ruthless prosecution of the war to a triumphant end.

The moment the War was over I equally stood for a ruthless prosecution of peace to an even more glorious end. Those who make war, whether they are individuals or nations, cannot escape responsibility for the peace.

Europe is in a deplorable condition. Who is responsible? What is responsible? Some say it is the Treaty of Versailles. Well, I am not here to defend the Treaty of Versailles; I am quite willing, on an appropriate occasion, to do so, and to say that it was the best treaty that could be negotiated under the conditions of the time. But it is not the Treaty of Versailles! Every treaty depends not merely upon its intrinsic merits, but upon the methods and manner of its execution.

When I was driving out of Washington I noticed warnings to motorists on the roadside. Evidently motorists give some trouble in that city if in no other. The road was a winding road; it could not go absolutely straight from point to point. What road can? It had to dodge hills and difficulties; it had to cross ravines and rivers, and it was a road that was adapted, like every other road, to the configuration of the country. And motorists, evidently some, drove recklessly, drove wildly, drove injudiciously, and there was this notice on the road-side: "This road is not fool-proof."

I put that on the front page of every treaty and statute.

But the condition of Europe was not created by the Treaty of Versailles. The difficulties were not created by that treaty. They were created by the War. They were created by the completeness of the victory. It was the most complete victory that has almost ever been won in wars between great nations. Germany, Austria, were shattered, demoralized, disarmed, prostrate; we left them like broken-backed creatures on the road for any chariot to run over. We created the responsibility. Who did it? Who did it?

Who smashed Germany? Who destroyed Austria? Who created this impotence which makes it difficult to execute treaties? Well, if you had asked it on Armistice Day, we all would have gently hinted that it was really done by us.

There was an old preacher in our country who, going on the Saturday night to his preaching engagement, saw on the roadside a haystack, very neat, very well put together; it looked very firm. And he saw a farmer standing alongside it, and he said, "Who made that excellent haystack?" "Oh," he said, "I did it; I did it."

The following day there was a great storm, and on Monday morning, when the old preacher was returning that way, the haystack had been scattered all over the field in hopeless confusion. And he saw the same farmer standing there, and he said to him, "That was very badly put together; that was not very well done. Who did it?"

"Well," he said, "we did it somehow between us."

That is really true of the condition of things in Europe; we were all responsible for the victory; we each contributed his part; we each did something toward shattering the fabric and we have got our responsibility for what follows. It is easier to make war than to make peace. In the Civil War in America there were millions of men who were prepared to sacrifice their lives to wage successful war, but there was only one man who was prepared to risk his career to make a successful peace, and he was shot down. You say, "Yes, by an unbalanced mind." All vengeance is unbalanced. Every vindictive man or woman is partly insane.

Your Chairman has referred to the great step taken recently by your Government to try to restore order out of chaos in Europe. I acclaim that step with full enthusiasm. When it was first proposed a year ago I felt it was the right step to take. It is suggested that I have been using flattering words since I came here about that proposal. The moment it was published in December of last year I wrote an article supporting that proposal—I thought it was the right course to take, and I am glad that at last there is some prospect of its being acted upon.

I have only two things to say about its future course. I do not know how many ladies and gentlemen there are here who play golf. Just a few, I see. There are two principles which are constantly dinned into the ear of the golfer which I would apply to Mr. Secretary Hughes' proposal now. The first is, follow through. The second is, keep your eye on the ball. It might get lost. You are playing in rough country, full of bunkers, part of a wilderness. There are some who might try and get the ball into the rough and once it is there they might even substitute another. Follow through. Keep your eye on the ball, once you have begun. And if you do that I believe this great play will be won. Europe will be better for it. America will be better for it. The world will be better for it. Humanity will be better, civilization will be better for it. The world is better because America at one moment took an interest in the enforcement of right beyond its own frontiers. The world will be better tomorrow when it knows that the interest of America in human right has not weakened.

You sent millions of your most gallant young men, brave, dauntless. I saw them in France; I knew their quality. The mere sight of them gave confidence to us, who had been for three and four years going through the valley of despair. You sent millions of them to enforce Justice. Justice is not sporadic. Justice is not an explosion which spends its force on a single outburst, and then vanishes into thin air. Justice is the steadfast will to see right done in the world. That is why I hail this step with acclamation, and I wish it, from my heart, success.

Your country and ours have very largely the same problems to consider and to confront. There is a natural disinclination in England to get entangled in European politics. It is traditional. We have always stood more or less by the policy of isolation. We have said, "We are an island in the Atlantic. We have got the sea between us and you," and in the past it has proved to be just as difficult to cross the Straits of Dover as to cross the Atlantic Ocean, when the British fleet is about.

So there is a very strong section, a powerful section of opinion, which pleads for leaving Europe alone. They say, "Turn yours eyes away from that confusion; give your minds to developing the resources of the British Empire. Leave that turbulent continent and don't worry about it." Well, it is no use getting angry with Europe. It has passed through a terrible time.

Supposing you had had an earthquake which swept over America and either killed or crippled every young able-bodied man in the whole of the Eastern States of America from the St. Lawrence to the Gulf of Mexico; supposing you had had enormous accumulations which had been the result of the industry of generations scattered and destroyed—that will give you an idea of what Europe has passed through. Between those who have been killed and those who have been mutilated, Europe has lost over 20,000,000 of her best young men, and the destruction of property, of wealth, of the accumulated fruits of industry has been gigantic. No wonder Europe is distracted, Europe is nerve wracked, when she hears a rumble; no wonder she gets into a panic. Don't think harshly of Europe.

There are events in the lives of men and in the lives of nations which are like the fall of the autumn leaves. They fall by the myriad to the ground. They are swept by the breezes into unconsidered corners, where they are forgotten; they sink into the soil and form part of the earth. We cultivate, we dwell upon them, or tread upon them. Nothing more of them is heard; they are indistinguishable from others.

But once in a century there are events which are like the fall of the stars, the fragments strike the earth and send it rocking and reeling out of its course. Look at Europe before the war, study the map of Europe today, its geography, its frontiers, its currency, its condition, its people, its Governments—study its pension lists. There were empires that were like the planets in the heavens that have been rolled down into utter endless darkness. There were countries that were like the fixed stars in the firmament, they have crashed into atoms. The earth quivers in Europe, and no one can tell how far it has been shocked out of its course. Don't be hard on Europe.

But they say to us in Britain and they say to you here, "Keep clear of the wreckage." Yes, but there are millions underneath. There is Scriptural precept for it. It has only happened on the Continent of Europe. Great nations cannot say, "Am I my brother's keeper?" Europe has played a great part. There would have been no known America, had there been no Europe to find it. You have got a great, virile population. It came from Europe. You have got great names that inspire your people, and will continue to do so world without end—George Washington, Franklin, Jefferson, Hamilton, Lincoln. They all sprang from European stock. Your free institutions in this country—and well you may be proud of them—the great struggle for civil and religious equality, came from the long agony of Europe. May I say with reverence, when the cross was turned out of Asia and hunted out of Africa, Europe stood by it, carried it through the Via Dolorosa of the Dark Ages, and if it is planted firmly on American soil, Europe carried it here. Don't be hard on Europe!

What is the real problem in Europe today? I will tell you. In spite of the war, because Europe has been left so much to herself, she still believes in force. Why?

France says: "Alsace Lorraine was torn from our side fifty years ago. It was unjust; it was wrong; it was cruel; it was oppressive. Justice never gave it back to us. We had to lose 1,400,000 of our young men. You, in the British Empire, had to lose 900,000 of your young men. Force gave it back to us."

Poland! Poland says: "One hundred and fifty years ago our nationhood was destroyed. We were locked in the prison of great autocracies. We waited for justice. We thought we could hear possible footsteps, but they were simply the footsteps of our jailers outside. Force came at the end of 150 years and unlocked the door."

The Russian peasant says today: "We never saw the light of liberty until the revolutionist came with his powder and blew our prison walls down."

What does Germany say? Germany says: "We trusted to justice. We trusted to a treaty. We are broken; we are shattered. Why? We are disarmed. We have no force." That is why Europe believes in force.

That is why Europe believes in violence. What is the remedy? Give Europe the conviction that right is supreme over force. Who is to do it? There are only two countries on earth which can establish that conviction, and those are the United States of America and the British Empire.

Unless it is done I don't know what is going to happen. France, at the present moment—and I am sorry for it; I have always been a friend of France; I have always been a believer in French democracy; during the thirty-four years I have been in the British Parliament I have always supported France when she had few friends—at the present moment she is committed to holding the wolf by the ear. She cannot let go, but ultimately it may tear and rend her.

I heard yesterday from a man who had just returned from Germany, who met one of the officers who had been appointed at the Treaty of Versailles to break up the cannon and the machine guns and the torpedoes of Germany. He said up to the last year the German workmen, whenever he went to the work shops and arsenals, used to help him to destroy these guns and say, "For God's sake, destroy them; these are the things that brought ruin on our country." Now he says there is a change. There is a change. They say, "We cannot trust justice, we cannot trust treaties, we cannot trust the word of great nations, force is the only thing that rules in the world." Unless you stamp out that conviction, civilization's doomed on this earth. That is why I don't know.

Why do I say that these great nationalities are the only two that can provide the remedy? These two countries entered the War for no selfish purpose. You came in to redress a great wrong. So did we. I remember a few days before the War—I was Chancellor of the Exchequer—I had to deal with the great financial interests in the City of London, and of one accord they came along and said, "Keep out of this quarrel; we don't want to get mixed up in it." There was no reason why we should. We had no quarrel at that moment with Germany. Germany was our best customer on the Continent of Europe. They were giving a guarantee that they would not send their fleet even down the English Channel. But—I think it was Saturday came the word that treaties were to be dealt with as if they were scraps of paper; that international right was to be trampled upon; that a little nation was to be destroyed purely because it was weak. From that moment the nation rose, forty-two millions, as one man, and we entered the War.

Why did we enter the War? Why did you enter the War? Why did the unanimous impulse come to you? You cannot tell, you cannot tell—mystic—the wind bloweth where it listeth, and we know not whence it cometh nor whither it goeth. It was one of those great impulses which come when a nation's sense of justice is outraged. That is why I say that nations that are moved by such incentives are the only sure guarantors of freedom and civilization in the world.

There have been times in the history of the world when you had two or three nations that for the time being have been the trustees of civilization. One after another they have failed.

They have not discharged their functions, and in spite of the efforts and the power they enjoyed in the days of their might one after another they went and new nations sprang up to take their place. The commission of trusteeship for civilization does not come from kings; it does not come from rulers or princes; it does not come from Senates and Parliaments nor councils. It comes from on high. When it comes it does not come from the choice of the people; it comes from the will of God.

That commission—that commission is yours and ours today. The scene is a divine one. You responded to the invisible message in 1917 and we had already done so; but the commission is not fulfilled. The work is only half done. If it is not discharged fully—fully—civilization is doomed within this generation to a catastrophe such as the world has never seen. But if you here, this mighty people, if our people throughout the British Empire, resolutely, firmly, courageously, without flinching carry out the message, then I have no fear but what humanity will climb to higher altitudes of nobility, of security, of happiness, than any it has ever yet known."

By permission of *The New York Times.*

THE CUSTODIANS OF GLORY

ELBERT LEE TRINKLE

Elbert Lee Trinkle, former Governor of Virginia, was born March 12, 1876 and was educated at Hampden-Sidney College and the University of Virginia. He practices law in Wytheville, Virginia, and is first vice-president of the Shenandoah Life Insurance Company, of Roanoke, Virginia. After serving as a member of the Virginia Senate 1914–1920, Mr. Trinkle was elected Governor of that state by the largest majority ever given in Virginia, for the term 1922–1926.

The following address of Mr. Trinkle was delivered at the beginning of the carving of the Confederate Monument on Stone Mountain, Georgia, June 18, 1923.

It was with a sense of gratification that I received your invitation to be with you, and it was with a feeling of distinct pleasure that I accepted it.

I bring with me to Georgia from the Commonwealth of Virginia the sincerest wishes to your State and people, together with the heartiest God-speed to the gigantic project which you inaugurate today.

Apart from that pleasure inevitable upon visiting your metropolitan City of Atlanta, I experience a deep sense of gratitude that I have found it possible to be present on this occasion which, I profoundly believe, will become historic. For, if I am not deceived, you gentlemen have begun a work unique in the history of the world, a work differing from all other work so far undertaken by man, in that this work is destined to live through time.

Rumor of your Titanic undertaking has spread far and wide. Reports of a proposed sculptured mountain in stone have sped through the press. Pictures of Stone Mountain have been scattered broadcast through pictorial reviews. But no man, who has not actually visualized the proportions of Stone Mountain, and who has not mentally summed up the task which you undertake, can appreciate in the smallest degree the measure of your proposed accomplishment, or what that proposed accomplishment will mean.

Your object is to perpetuate a glorious truth in undying stone; to spread upon the time-defying face of Stone Mountain a mighty memorial to the most glorious government recorded by history in annals of mankind.

In ages past the Old World had her hero kings and imperial conquerors. In ages past whole peoples were empressed through servitude to build high monuments to the memory of these monarchs. Only a few months ago one of the last of the Pharaohs made his reappearance into the world of light and air from a sepulcher in which he had been entombed more than 3000 years. Still pyramids stand in Egypt, but these monuments will, like Pharaoh, yet crumble under the mace of time.

In this, our land of freedom, in this Western World, no throned monarchs ever held sway since the shackles of George III were burst asunder by our Colonial armies and the Constitution of the United States was laid as the cornerstone and foundation for our laws.

But while we do not in this country boast of conquerors and of kings, we have yet a higher claim to glory, we possess yet a surer title to immortality. And particularly is this true of our great land of the South—the fairest, purest and brightest land on which God ever smiled.

Just prior to the tornado of civil war which swept over this country in the early sixties what, in the estimation of many, was its golden age, came to Dixie. The era of which I speak was one of peace and of plenty. There was a landed aristocracy throughout the South as proud and as potent as the titled nobility of England. Honor was the yardstick by which men were measured. Honesty was the social countersign, without which none was permitted to pass.

The leadership of the government of the nation had reposed in large measure in the keeping of southern statesmen. Virginia, the

Mother of States, became known also as the Mother of Presidents. Culture, power and plenty brooded over the States of the South. And then came the Civil War. For four years the armies of the Confederacy stood up against the combined resources of the world. For four years the gray-clad heroes of the South carved with their sabers a record of glory which we now propose to cut into Stone Mountain.

I am not here, my friends, to recite to you the drama of the war of the Confederacy. Since childhood every man and every woman in Dixie has been kept familiar with that legend of glory which tells the story of the Old South in the war between the States.

All of the South became a battlefield of the mighty conflict. Even here, where we stand today, the tide of battle swept along. And it is here, on this consecrated ground, that God himself has raised up a mountain of granite as a memorial which will last through the ages, and on this tablet of rock it is our purpose to inscribe gigantic figures, representing the chieftains of our armies of the South.

Here, in stone, will be gathered in endless cavalcade the military Captains of the Confederacy mounted on a journey through time. In the forefront will be stationed that peerless leader of Georgia, General John B. Gordon, Beauregard, of immortal memory, will represent, in part, the great State of Louisiana, while each of the other sister States of the South will contribute her quota of heroes in this eternal tapestry in stone. Jefferson Davis, President of the Confederate States, among the greatest statesmen and orators this country has produced, will be found in consultation with his military leaders. Davis, almost as much a martyr as Lincoln, gigantic in disaster, sublime even in imprisonment and in defeat.

And there, my friends, will be seen those pillars of Hercules of the Confederate Cause, Jackson and Lee—the master strategists of the Western World, and the white-plumed chieftains of the purest cause for which men ever died.

Soldiers of the South, chieftains of the States of the Unforgettable Cause, warriors of truth who, cut into this mountain of rock, are to defy time itself, I salute you!

Generations unborn will make a pilgrimage to this Mecca of Glory here to feast their eyes in admiration upon the deathless heroes of an undying cause.

God of truth, under Thy guidance the Confederate Government arose. God of battle, under Thy leadership the hosts of the South fought and strove. God of wisdom and of mercy, in Thine inscrutable providence it was decreed and destined that that Government should fall, but that in its decline and ruin it should set a new standard of imperishable glory as a guide to all that is best.

Upon Stone Mountain will we tell the story of the glory of that Government. Posterity will be the richer for this sermon in stone which we will entrust to the keeping of this immovable and immemorial rock. Thus, by the assistance of nature, we will have accomplished a feat hitherto deemed impossible by men. We will have erected a monument which will outlive the centuries and which will carry the history of our Southern War to a future so distant that the mind of man is not fitted to grasp it.

Since the youth of the world, mountains have been the sanctuary of truth, the refuge of freedom. What are they but the miracles of God in nature—palaces of eternity—temples of time!

The memorials of man, erected in pomp and in vanity, come and are gone, like a shadow on the desert, like a dream in the night. The capitals of kings are built but to perish; some are leveled slowly by the march of the centuries, others engulfed and consumed in a moment, like Pompeii at the foot of Vesuvius.

In fundamental and in basic wisdom we are not superior to the ancients, to those patriarchs of old time who took their instruction from the great school of nature. And it was the intuitive wisdom of the Egyptians to trust the mountains.

When this people erected a memorial they would place it near one of their larger cities, but when they buried the body of Pharaoh they sought out the valley of kings.

My friends, we do not come to buy greatness in a valley but to enthrone glory on the mountains. We do not come to place our lamps in a sepulcher, but to rekindle the beacon of undying and imperishable truth upon the eternal crags and everlasting summits of the immemorial mountains of Georgia.

The record of mankind, written by the hand of man, service but for the moment. It is at best, but a legend traced in sand on the beach of time, obliterated by the waves of the ocean of eternity.

We recall the fate of the library at Alexandria. Even the works of the Roman historians fail us. The history of civilization, as inscribed in architecture and in monuments, also passes. Where is that glory which was Babylon; where the Ephesian temple to Diana; where the Colossus of Rhodes? Even the marble monuments of that seat of the Cæsars, misnamed the "Eternal City," have crumbled. The history of the ancient world remains but a record written in ruins. How then, can man circumvent the corroding power of time and perpetuate a record through eternity? It is a question as old as history itself, yet a problem so far unsolved.

There is but one principle which is eternal, and this is truth. There is but one monument which is everlasting and that is a mountain. When, then, we have cut that eternity, which is truth, into that eternity, which is a mountain, we may be said to have defied the future. Calling God to help us, upon the eternal granite of His eternal hills, we will chisel deep the inscription of that truth known to the world as the Confederate Cause. Such will be the answer of the South to the question of how truth can be perpetuated; such will be the defiance of the South to time. For here, on this eternal cliff, will we erect our memorial to our imperishable dead. Here, in this volume of nature, in this Book of God, will we write the record of those leaders who can never die. When the pyramids of the Pharaohs shall have crumbled; when imperial Rome shall have faded into a mockery of memory; when the Lion of Lucerne shall sleep in dust; when eternity itself shall have snowed its years upon us and the white winter of the world has come; still, cut into the face of these mountains of stone, will the immortal leaders of the South remain, enduring as the Rock of Ages—defying time.

It is an awful contemplation, standing upon the unstable brink of the present, gazing down the dim vista of the centuries. How many moons will wax and wane, how many stars sprinkle their silver over these hilltops, how often will the trumpets of tempest and the bugles of storm shatter silence in these mountains of stone? Centuries will be born to die—age will follow age down the unending pathway of the years. Cities, governments, peoples will change and perish—while yet, our heroes carved in stone, still stand on guard—the custodians of imperishable glory, the sentinels of time.

By permission of the author.

THE LAWYERS WHO REALLY COUNT

THE EARL OF BIRKENHEAD

The Earl of Birkenhead (Frederick Edwin Smith, an Oxford graduate), was born at Birkenhead in 1872. Known first as a University lecturer in history, then as a practitioner of law and member of Parliament, he rose to be Lord Chancellor of Great Britain (1919–'22). During the World War he was with the British forces in France. He was Secretary for India, 1924–'28. The Earl of Birkenhead is the author of many writings on law, government, and commerce, including a volume of speeches.

This speech he delivered at the banquet of the American Bar Association in St. Paul, Minnesota, August, 1923.

THE late hour of the evening, the abundant harvest of admirable oratory which we have already enjoyed and the fact that you showed me so much indulgence in the course of a somewhat wearisome address a few nights ago, would combine to render it very unsuitable that I should make an extended demand upon your patience tonight.

I listened with great interest to the speech of the honorable Senator[1] who last addressed you. He reminded me of an occasion in London in which it was suggested that I made use of observations which, in the mouth of a hostile critic, might be supposed to be derogatory to the honorable Senator. Gentlemen, I will be extremely frank with you. I have no defense to the charge which the honorable Senator made against me as to that which I said to the chairman of the meeting, except that I had not the slightest idea that the honorable Senator could overhear what I did say.

Now it has occurred to me that in the very few observations which I ask leave to make tonight I might deal with the only lawyers who really count. All the world over, in every country in the world, there are of course some lawyers who make fortunes by comparatively unimportant dealings with property or railways of companies and all that complicated series of transactions which I have never been able to understand, but those are not really the lawyers to which the whole world owes a debt of gratitude. The world understands the lawyers, and everybody understands what you mean when you say you are going to see a dentist, or you are going to see a doctor, and every lady understands what you mean when you say you are going to see a lawyer. There are lawyers in that sense. It is in that sense that I use the term lawyer; the only lawyers who really count are the advocates, because the advocates step in when something serious is happening or maybe going to happen. Say it may be a murder case, it may be all kinds of other cases, but it is the advocate that really in the popular mind represents the lawyer, and it is in the discharge of the advocate's task that the immense appeal which the profession of the lawyer makes to the civilized world resides.

---

[1] Ex-Senator J. Hamilton Lewis, of Illinois.

I was an advocate for a great many years. I have been a judge now for five years. I spent the greater part of my life in being an advocate, and I am bound to say that the most amusing years in my life were spent when I was at the Bar, and incidentally, I might add, the most profitable years of my life. And of all the cases in which I was ever employed I never remember being so completely disconcerted as when I was attempting to cross-examine a witness in the very first case which I had the fortune to have at the Bar; and I may say to those here who happen to be laymen that it is not the barrister's business, and he does not like, to be disconcerted by a witness. It is considered to be unfair, rather bad form—on the part of the witness. But by a strange chance the very first case in which I took part was the one which disconcerted me more than any other in which I was ever engaged. It was a small collision case and I appeared for the steamship company against the owners of a sailing schooner in respect of a collision which took place in the river Mersey. I was developing a most masterly cross-examination of the master of the schooner, my simple scheme being to prove that the man was drunk and had been drunk for two hours before the collision took place, instead of attending to the navigation of his vessel. Unfortunately, in my desire to be impressive I carried the matter just one stage too far, because I said, "Captain, I want you to understand the question I am putting to you and its implication: I put to you this, for an hour and a half before this collision took place you were drunk in your cabin?" And he said, "I was not." And I said, "I put it to you that for an hour and a half before this collision you were never on the bridge of your vessel?" And he replied, "There ain't no bridge on a s'iling ship."

Well, gentlemen, you will agree with me that he was an extremely rude man. But I did not at that moment and in that stage of my professional development quite see the answer to that observation. And I have never succeeded in seeing it since, and I have reflected deeply. I suspect that many of you must have had experiences of that kind, but I confess now that I look at the Bar rather from the same kind of an angle from which I imagine that my distinguished friend, the Chief Justice of the United States, looks at it. And now I will take the Bar, to this extent, into our confidence, that in our country—not indeed in yours, because with that consideration of time which distinguishes a businesslike community, I understand that the eloquence of counsel is nicely and meticulously regulated by an hour glass—but in our old-fashioned country where time counts for so little in comparison with yours, the eloquence of counsel is regulated only by the tact or resolute qualities of the Bench. And therefore we are very much at the mercy of counsel, and that is the reason why all judges in England always treat all counsel with great courtesy and consideration.

I cannot understand why any American judge should ever take the trouble to treat counsel with such consideration, because he can stop him whenever he wants. Our trouble is that we cannot. There is a well known story of the counsel who was addressing the Court of Appeals and he had exhausted, with about a three hours' margin to spare, alike all the relevant topics with which he was reasonably concerned and equally the patience of the tribunal. They made every attempt to put him down. They failed to put him down. It was a hot day and they proceeded to go to sleep. I suppose even in America, judges occasionally, like Homer, sleep. But he let loose one phrase of hope. It was almost the only phrase of hope in the whole of his long two hours' argument. He said, "My lord, when I reached that point in my argument in the court below, the court stopped me." The Master of the Rools presiding over the Court, I imagine incautiously supposed to have been sleeping, suddenly developed into a brusque activity, and he leaned over and said, "In God's name, how did they do it?" To which the learned counsel quite imperturbably replied, "My lord, by fraudulently pretending to be with me."

And then there was the case of that other counsel, this was an Irishman, who also developed an inexhaustible argument upon an exhaustible case. After he had gone on for four hours the President of the Court said to him, "Mr. Murphy, is it any good for you to continue? Everything you say goes in at one ear and comes out of the other." "Why not," said the counsel, "there is little enough to stop it." But some of the wittiest things that were ever said at the Bar in my experience were said by a layman who had fallen upon tragic days, a layman most sophisticated in forensic ways, I mean Mr. Bottomly.[1] I have observed the play of his wit and of his capacity in many cases and I must say that I never heard a readier-witted man in any court of law. I remember once when someone brought a libel action against him, I represented the publishers and another advocate represented the editor, or some such arrangement as that. The plaintiff did not appear. The plaintiff, according to Mr. Bottomly's view, was a man of slightly irregular habits, and he invited the learned judge, who was Mr. Justice Darling, to postpone the case to the luncheon interval in order to give the plaintiff an opportunity

[1] Editor of *John Bull*, a sensational London weekly publication.

of appearing because, as you gentlemen well know, a plaintiff who seeks to recover damages for injury to his character in a libel suit does not put his case very high if he does not even go into the witness box. So at two o'clock Mr. Justice Darling ordered the name of the plaintiff to be called by the ushers outside the court. The jury, of course, who were to decide the case, were in their box. So they called outside of the court, "Mr. Jones!", or whatever the plaintiff's name was, three or four times. Then the ushers came back and said, "My lord, there is no answer." Mr. Bottomly arose quietly and said, "May I make a suggestion?" And Mr. Justice Darling said, "Certainly," and Mr. Bottomly said, "The ushers have not yet tried the refreshment bar."

The effect of that insidious and poisonous suggestion upon the minds of the jury may very easily be imagined.

And I remember in the same case—it was not Mr. Bottomly's habit at that time to go very frequently into the witness box—that counsel for the absentee plaintiff, in order that he might attempt to obtain some counter advantage, in the course of his speech said, "Wait until Mr. Bottomly goes into the witness box." He never thought, of course, that Mr. Bottomly would go. But Mr. Bottomly had taken his measure very completely and departing from his usual habit, the moment the plaintiff's case was over, stepped to the witness box and said, "If you wish to cross-examine me here I am." The plaintiff counsel was a junior member of the bar, and the last thing he wanted to do was to cross-examine Mr. Bottomly. When he got into the witness box, he said, "Mr. Bottomly, I believe there are forty-eight petitions in bankruptcy filed against you at this moment, are there not?" "Oh, surely," said Mr. Bottomly, "far, far more than that." Then following that matter for two or three sentences more, he said, "Now Mr. Bottomly, I am going to ask you a serious question." Mr. Bottomly replied, "Yes? No doubt to distinguish it from your previous one."

Gentlemen, no one who has lived his life at the Bar as I have lived mine and you have lived yours, can fail to remember many hundreds of diverting incidents that have occurred in the practice of our profession and how welcome they are. How dull most cases are, and how eagerly we receive any little illumination which comes from wit, even if it be judicial wit. I have listened to the glee, not always I thought disinterested, with which the efforts of some of my brethren have been received by an intelligent Bar, and I can speak of this quite indifferently because in the whole five years which I have been on the Bench I have never made a joke, I have never said a funny thing, and indeed I have thought of quite a number of funny things I could say. But we have one very witty judge in England, Mr. Justice Darling, and I shall close this series of random and discursive reminiscences with one illustration of what I think was a very considerable instance of judicial humor at its best.

This was an occasion when the Attorney-General was attempting to confiscate large German financial interests in certain lines. The issue arose under our emergency war legislation. The case was of enormous complication and I had been working it up for several weeks, and the day was fixed for hearing. Two days before the hearing the attorney for the defendants came before Justic Darling and asked for an adjournment for a month. Mr. Justice Darling said to me, "What are you going to say to this?" And I said, "It is a most unreasonable application. We have been preparing this case for a month. They have known the day upon which the case was coming on and to apply two days before for a month's adjournment is wholly unreasonable and the application ought to be rejected." So the judge said to the counsel on the other side, "Why do you ask for so long a period of delay as a month?" And counsel replied, "Because the documents in the case are extremely bulky and they all relate to German Mining Law and the language employed is all German and is all extremely complicated." Mr. Justice Darling replied, "Rather a good idea occurs to me. You want to get this translated. Why not go to somebody who knows German already?"

Well, gentlemen, I suspect that the comedy and the humor of our great profession as it is practiced in this country does not differ very greatly from those qualities as it is practiced in my own country. And after all, when the last joke is made at the expense of the lawyer, and more particularly at the expense of the advocate, it still remains the noblest and in many ways the bravest profession in the world. The advocate knows little preclusion upon his one special task, and that is to strive against all forces, however powerful, against all combinations however wealthy, and at all costs for the fortunes of the client. My predecessor on the woolsack, the great Lord Brougham, put it indeed even too high, for he said, "The advocate knows no duty and no restraint except such duties and such restraints as are imposed upon him by the interests of his client." That is too broadly stated, but it can be stated broadly enough to indicate the qualities and the resources and the courage that are required of the advocate who fully discharges his duty. I remember well a case in which it became the duty of Sir Edward Clark, when the head of the English Bar, to cross-examine with severity that distinguished Prince, who afterwards became known to history as King Edward VII. No personal choice could have rendered such a duty attractive. Every consideration of personal inclination must have repelled the advocate from that task. But it was discharged with a courage and an unshrinking completeness, with an unswerving duty to his client, as if the man he was cross-examining were the humblest citizen of England.

And here we get rid at once of all the sophistry with which this topic has been involved. When people who are not lawyers ask "how can an advocate appear on behalf of a client whom he knows to be guilty?" the answer is that no advocate has any business to know that his client is guilty. In my younger days in the Bar I appeared in many criminal cases. I never in the whole course of my career allowed any criminal for whom I was appearing to have confidences with me. I do not know that many of them were extremely ambitious of the distinction, but if they were they did not obtain it. The robust common sense of Doctor Johnson led him to say the first word and the last word upon this debated topic. He said, "The advocate is not to usurp the functions of the judge; the advocate is to make himself the mouthpiece of him who is accused." And if you take the extremest case of all, the case where it has been put at its strongest against the ethical situation of our profession, the case where a confession has been made by a prisoner to an advocate—I would meet that case without hesitation. It arose once at a critical stage of a great English litigation. I would meet that by saying, "You are not to be the judge of whether that confession is made under an aberration, under a delusion, in hysteria; you are to put the whole facts of that case as those facts are known to you before the jury and before the judge, and they and not you are to decide as to the facts that have been proved, and as to the reliability of that which has been admitted."

Ladies and gentlemen, the ethics of our profession have been made the subject of infinite debate. On the whole through the generations and through the centuries they have sustained the force of every hostile animadversion that has been made upon them, and in dark and critical days in every great democracy in the world the advocates of the country by their devotion and their courage have made themselves the principal maintainers and buttresses of liberty. It was well said that under a despot the quality of rhetoric counts for little, but in every free country it counts for much. It has been that quality, the quality of rhetoric —infinitely flexible, admitting of infinitely various applications, emotional it may be when attuned to an emotional cause, dry and analytic when the ocasion calls for an exhibition of that form of forensic skill—is the greatest gift which God gave to man, and it is exhibited, I deliberately state my conclusion, more conspicuously and more bountifully by the legal population of the great Democratic countries of the world than by any section of any population which the world in its gradual progress towards complete civilization has reached.

From *The American Bar Association Journal.*

WHICH KNEW NOT JOSEPH

BRUCE BARTON

Bruce Barton, author, editor, and speaker, was born in Robbins, Tennessee, in 1886. He received an A.B. from Amherst in 1907; was managing editor or editor of magazines in Chicago and New York, and became widely known as a periodical contributor of very readable articles of keen business philosophy. Mr. Barton now heads a large advertising agency in New York.

This address was delivered before the Public Relations Section of the National Electric Light Association, New York, 1923.

THERE are two stories—and neither of them is new—which I desire to tell you, because they have a direct application to everyone's business. The first concerns a member of my profession, an advertising man, who was in the employ of a circus. It was his function to precede the circus into various communities, distribute tickets to the editor, put up on the barns pictures of the bearded lady and the man-eating snakes, and finally to get in touch with the proprietor of some store and persuade him to purchase the space on either side of the elephant for his advertisement in the parade.

Coming one day to a crossroads town, our friend found that there was only one store. The proprietor did not receive him enthusiastically. "Why should I advertise?" he demanded. "I have been here for twenty years. There isn't a man, woman or child around these parts that doesn't know where I am and what I sell." The advertising man answered very promptly (because in our business if we hesitate we are lost), and he said to the proprietor, pointing across the street, "What is that building over there?" The proprietor answered, "That is the Methodist Episcopal Church." The advertising man said, "How long has that been there?" The proprietor said, "Oh, I don't know; seventy-five years probably." "*And yet,*" exclaimed the advertising man, "*they ring the church bell every Sunday morning.*"

My second story has also a religious flavor. It relates to a gentleman named Joseph, who is now deceased.

Those of you who were brought up on the Bible may have found there some account of his very remarkable business career. Those of you who have not read that book may have heard of Joseph through the works of Rudyard Kipling.

Said Mr. Kipling:

> Who shall doubt the secret hid
> Under Cheops' pyramid
> Was that the contractor did
> Cheops out of several millions.
> And that Joseph's sudden rise
> To comptroller of supplies
> Was a graft of monstrous size
> Worked on Pharaoh's swart civilians.

The account of Joseph in the Old Testament is much more complete and to his credit. It tells how he left his country under difficulties and, coming into a strange country, he rose, through his diligence, to become the principal person in the state, second only to the King. Now, gentlemen, the Biblical narrative brings us to that point—the point where Joseph had public relations with all the other ancient nations, while his private relations held all the best-paying jobs—it brings us up to the climax of his career and then it hands us an awful jolt. Without any words of preparation or explanation, it says bluntly:

> "And Joseph died, and there arose a new king in Egypt which knew not Joseph."

I submit, gentlemen, that this is one of the most staggering lines which has ever been written in a business biography. Here was a man so famous that everybody knew him and presto, a few people die, a few new ones are born, and *nobody* knows him. The tide of human life has moved on; the king who exalted the friends of Joseph is followed by a king who makes them slaves; all the advertising that the name "Joseph" had enjoyed in one generation is futile and of no avail, *because that generation has gone.*

Now, what has all that to do with you? Very much indeed. When we gathered in this room this afternoon, there were in this country, in bed, sick, several thousand old men. It perhaps is indelicate for me to refer to that fact, but it is a fact, and we are grown up and we have to face these things. On those old men you gentlemen collectively have spent a considerable amount of time and a considerable amount of money. It is to be supposed that you have made some impression upon them regarding your service and your purposes and your necessities. But in this interval, while we have been sitting here, those old men have died and all your time and all your money and whatever you have built up in the way of good-will in their minds—*all* your labor and investment have passed out with them.

In the same brief interval, there have been born in this country several thousand lusty boys and girls to whom you gentlemen mean no more than the Einstein theory. They do not know the difference between a Mazda lamp and a stick of Wrigley's chewing gum. Nobody has ever told them that Ivory Soap floats or that children cry for Castoria, or what sort of soap you ought to use if you want to have a skin that people would like to touch. The whole job of giving them the information they are going to need in order to form an intelligent public opinion and to exercise an intelligent influence in the community has to be started from the beginning and done over again.

So the first very simple thing that I would say to you (and it is so simple that it seems to me it ought to be said at every convention of this kind) is that this business of public relations is a very constant business, that the fact that you told your story yesterday should not lead you into the delusion of supposing that you have ever told it. There is probably no fact in the United States that is easier to impress upon people's minds than that Ivory Soap floats, and yet the manufacturers of Ivory Soap think it is not inconsistent or wasteful to spend more than a million dollars a year in repeating that truth over and over again.

Cultivating good-will is a day-by-day and hour-by-hour business, gentlemen. Every day and every hour the "king" dies and there arises a new "king" to whom you and all your works mean absolutely nothing.

Now, the second very simple thing which I might say to you is that in your dealings with the public, in what you write and say, you must be genuine.

When I came to New York a great many years ago I had a lot of trouble with banks. It was very hard to find any bank that would be willing to accept the very paltry weekly deposit that I wanted to make. Finally I discovered one which was not as closely guarded as the others, and I succeeded for a period of three years in being insulted by the teller every Saturday. At the end of three years when I came to draw out my money I had an audience with the vice-president who wanted personally to insult me. I said to myself, if I live and grow old in this town, some day I think I would like to take a crack at this situation.

And so as the years passed (as they have the habit of doing), and I lived and grew old, one day a bank official came in to us and said he would like to have us do some advertising for him. I said to this banker, "Now you go back to your office and shave off all the side-whiskers that there are in your bank and you take all the high hats and carry them out into the back yard of the bank and put them in a pile and light a match to the pile and burn them up, because I am going to advertise to people that you're human, and it may be a shock to have them come in and find you as you are."

So he went back to his bank and I wrote an advertisement which said:

> "There is a young man in this town who is looking for a friendly bank; a bank where the officers will remember his name and where some interest will be shown when he comes in," etc.

It was very successful. It was *too* successful. It was so successful that we could not control it, and all over the country there broke out a perfect epidemic, a kind of measles, of "friendly banks." Bankers who had not smiled since infancy and who never had had or needed an electric fan in their offices suddenly sat up and said, "Why, we are friendly."

Well, our bank dropped out. The competition was too keen. But it culminated, I think, in a letter which I saw and which was mailed by the president of a really very important bank in a large city. I won't attempt to quote it verbatim, but it was to this effect:

> "Dear Customer: As I sit here all alone in my office on Christmas Eve thinking of you and how much we love you, I really wish that you and every other customer could come in here personally so I could give you a good, sound kiss."

Well, that is a trifle exaggerated, but the fact is this—if you don't feel these things you can't make other people feel them. Emerson said, as you will remember, "What you are thunders so loud I cannot hear what you say." Unless there is back of this desire for better public relations a real conviction, a real genuine feeling that you are in business as a matter of service, not merely as a matter of advertising service—unless there is that, then it is very dangerous, indeed, to attempt to talk to the public. For as sure as you live the public will find you out.

The third very simple thing, and the last thing that I suggest, is this: In dealing with the public the great thing is to deal with them simply, briefly, and in language that they can understand.

Two men delivered speeches about sixty years ago at Gettysburg. One man was the greatest orator of his day, and he spoke for two hours and a half, and probably nobody in the room can remember a single word that he said. The other man spoke for considerably less than five minutes, and every school child has at some time learned Lincoln's Gettysburg Address, and remembers it more or less all his life. Many prayers have been uttered in the world—many long, fine-sounding prayers—but the only prayer that any large majority of people have ever learned is the Lord's Prayer, and it is less than two hundred words long. The same thing is true of the Twenty-third Psalm, and there is hardly a Latin word in it. They are short, simple, easily understood words.

You electric light people have one difficulty. I was in Europe this spring, and I rode a great deal in taxicabs. In England I sat in a taxicab and watched the little clock go around in terms of shillings. Then I flew over to Amsterdam and watched it go around in terms of guilders. Then I went down to Brussels and it went around in terms of francs. Then I went to France and it went around in terms of francs of a different value.

I would sit there trying to divide fifteen into one hundred and multiply it by seven, and wonder just where I was getting off, and I have no doubt now that really I was transported in Europe at a very reasonable cost, but because those meters talked to me in terms that were unfamiliar I never stepped out of a taxicab without having a haunting suspicion that probably I had been "gyped."

In a degree you suffer like those taxicab men. You come to Mrs. Barton and you say, "Buy this washing machine and it will do your washing for just a few cents an hour." She says, "Isn't that wonderful!" She buys it, and at the end of the month she sits with your bill in her hands and she says, "We have run this five hours, and that will probably be so and so." Then she opens the bill and finds that she has not run it five hours; that she has run it 41 kw. and 11amp. and 32 volts, and that the amount is not so-and-so but it is $2.67.

Well, that is a matter that I suppose you will eventually straighten out.

Asking an advertising man to talk about advertising at a convention like this is a good deal like asking a doctor to talk about health. I have listened to many such addresses and they are all about the same. The eminent physician says, "Drink plenty of water. Stay outdoors as much as you can. Eat good food. Don't worry. Get eight hours' sleep. And if you have anything the matter with you, call a doctor."

So I say to you that there is a certain technique about this matter of dealing with the public, and if you have anything seriously the matter with you—whether it be a big advertising problem or merely a bad letterhead (and some of you have wretched letterheads)—there probably is some advertising doctor in your town who has made a business of the thing, and it may be worth your while to call him in. But in the meantime, and in this very informal and necessarily general talk, I say to you, "Be genuine, be simple, be brief; talk to people in language that they understand; and finally, and most of all, be persistent." You can't expect to advertise in flush times and live on the memory of it when you are hard up. You can't expect to advertise when you are in trouble, or about to be in trouble, and expect to get anything in that direction. It is a day-by-day and hour-by-hour business. If the money that has been thrown away by people who advertised spasmodically was all gathered together it would found and endow the most wonderful home in the world for aged advertising men and their widows. Don't throw any more of that money away. If advertising is worth doing at all, it is worth doing all the time. For every day, gentlemen, the "king" dies, and there arises a new "king" who knows not Joseph.

By permission of the author.

WHERE THE FRUIT IS FREEDOM

MAURICE SAMUELS

Maurice Victor Samuels is an author, more particularly a playwright. He was born in San Francisco, 1874, was graduated from the University of California, and practised law in San Francisco. Since 1902 Mr. Samuels has been engaged in literary work in New York.

This speech was delivered in September, 1924, at the Hotel Astor, New York City.

THERE is a story told about a professor who was discussing with his colleagues the manner in which the subject of love had been treated in a recent novel, when someone interrupted him with the question: "Professor, have you ever been in love?" The Professor stopped short, answered "No!" and withdrew from the gathering. Several months later he returned to a similar meeting with the announcement: "Gentlemen, let us begin the discussion all over again: I have remedied the defect!" I used to think that story clever, but its point has disappeared for me, now that, having been to Palestine, I stand before you, and you ask me: "Well, what have you to say?" It seems to me now that the Professor, after his adventure, if it was a true adventure, would have been much less prepared to discuss the subject than before: the deeper his emotions had been, the less able he would have been to give them form. And if the story goes to illustrate anything at all, it is the fact that the Professor had been conducting an academic experiment: he was still a professor—and not a lover.

Even here, among those who will listen with the utmost sympathy to what I shall report, I am embarrassed and confused by the question. I say, in all sincerity, that it is somehow too intimate a subject to open out on, as it were, on request. I do not know at which point to begin, for fear I should tread on ground which is so sacred to me that it will not bear discussion. And I cannot even take refuge behind a half-jest. The sense of humor has its limitations, and I stand before one of them.

Like all of you here, I have dreamed of Palestine for years. I used to explain the fascination of the place by its miraculous career in this history of humanity—by its miraculous rôle even in my own life. The best and the most enduring things I have known were either native to that country or were inspired by it. The whole world had left empty in my heart what the children of this tiny province had filled, and till this day the only ultimate comfort that life affords is the record of what certain men had done and felt there hundreds and hundreds of years ago.

This, I said, was the fascination of Palestine. And I was wrong.

I have been to Palestine and I know why we cannot forget. I know why it lingers in the blood of our people, never to be washed away. I know now that it is the country itself which has taken us captive for ever. The land, the mountains and valleys, the sunlight and the stars. If I have ever doubted the immortality of the Jewish people, I could not doubt it now. The Jews cannot die out because Palestine will not let them. And if you should ask me again: "What is the peculiar property of the place, what subtle characteristics is it that can capture unborn generations, and ensure a place for itself in hearts that will beat a thousand years hence?"—if you should ask me this, I would answer again: "I do not know." Only fools want to see the mechanism of a miracle—but this much a man may know—that when God performs a miracle, He makes it complete. The work is not botched and unbalanced, brilliant in one place, stupid in another. For the peculiar people and the peculiar Book, there was a peculiar land, and the people and the Book shall be as enduring as the land. As long as Mount Carmel will look out across the Great Sea to the Western world, and as long as the Jordan will flow between the hills of Judah and of Moab, so long will millions of Jewish hearts thrill to ancient memories and to new aspirations.

Yet these are only words. I could close my eyes now, and believe I stood again on a mountain peak in Samaria, above the valley of Jezreel, or on a slope of the Mount of Olives, with the Dead Sea at my feet and the shadows closing over the city of Jerusalem—and then there is nothing more to say. When men will have created a language without words, a language that passes by instinct from heart to heart, I should be able to tell you what I felt then, and you would know perhaps why Palestine is unforgettable.

And so I cannot talk of Palestine itself, I can talk only of things which seem incidentals, and do not lie too near the heart of my experience. And that which springs first to the lips is the mention of the colonies, those half-mythical creations that we have written and spoken about for nearly half a century. Are they there, and would you recognize them?

Come back with me, to that mountain top in Samaria, and look down again into the valley. You can see all of it: the points that are thirty miles away are as clear to the view as the pebbles underfoot. Five years ago that valley was almost empty. You could see the old Arab villages, grey in the sunlight, or the black tents of Bedouins spread out like a flock of gigantic bats that have come out into the day. But now, when you stand up there, you ask: "What is that cluster of bright buildings over there, and the green, planted fields surrounding it? And yonder cluster, so strangely new and fresh? And that other one, still further?" Those are Balfouria, and Ain Harod, and Tel Joseph, and Kfar Ezekiel, and Nahalaal. Then you descend the winding path of the hills and you enter the plain. You go by the Arab settlement, and you draw your breath and wonder why people should live in such poverty and such uncleanliness. The same fields are open to them, the same sky shines above them, but an oppressive hand seems to stamp the spirit out of them. You feel nothing but pity for these slaves of the soil, and you ask if no one will ever come to show them the way to a finer, freer life. Their homes are pitiful, sunbaked clay huts, huddled one on top of the other, as if in a mad stampede toward the central point of the village. You pass on, across an uncultivated waste, and come again to an island of rich green growth, grain and grapes and young fruit plantations. And you make your way along the path in the midst of them, and you reach the little city. There is a spirit in the place, the spirit of freedom. These homes are simple, but they are sturdy and well spaced. Go into one of them, and you will find yourself in the home of men and women who live worthily, with an understanding of human dignity. Their life is a life of labor, yet they have not become brutalized. Speak with them. They will tell you of hardship and of patient hope. But neither hardship long borne nor hope long deferred has subdued them. They believe in themselves and in the land. They talk of the seasons and the crops, they talk of their flocks and of the markets: yet they are not victims of the earth. They are still its masters.

Go into Upper Galilee, where the wastes of uncultivated earth are wider and more forbidding than in the South. Here the Arab settlements resemble more than ever the fugitive homes of nomads. Their huts seem to have been built for a day, for the season at longest. And even these settlements are few and far between. No trees overshadow them, no plantations give them a sense of permanence. You travel along the sunbaked road, the dust flies up, the sun beats down, there is no shade or respite. And then suddenly you find yourself under a green canopy. The road becomes an arbor, and the hot sky is shut out by interlacing leaves, a rest to the spirit as well as to the eye. Who built this canopy, who took the trouble, years and years ago, to plant trees for a later generation? This is the colony of Rosh Pinah, founded by the pioneers of forty years ago. There are peoples that have been in Palestine nearly forty times forty years. They cannot show you such an avenue of trees till this day.

Go further still, to the northernmost point of Palestine, which was till lately outside the boundary. Metullah, with its broad quiet street, its modern schoolhouse, its solid homes—and even a hotel. I say that a single settlement of ours carries the conviction of our natural connection with the soil.

Or go back south again, down into Judæa, which you can reach from the north between sunrise and sunset. Go into one of the oldest of the colonies, Petach Tikwah, and see how the oldest and the newest are being welded together. Petach Tikwah was founded by the generation which is now dying out, a generation of heroic men and women who did not have a powerful Zionist movement to urge them on. Around Petach Tikwah there are the sands of the desert. You would swear that nothing could grow here but wild cactus and thistles. In the midst of such a desert these pioneers settled forty years ago, and their love and their labor woke the fruitfulness of earth. There is not a richer sight in the world, compact in so small a place. The orange groves of Petach Tikwah have this year wiped out half the debts of the colonists: another such year, and they will be free from encumbrances. But to me the supreme beauty of Petach Tikwah was the settlement of nearly one thousand new Chaluzim, arrivals of the last few months and the last year or two, who are being welded into this, the largest of our colonies. You pass up the main street, with its houses that have already brought forth a new generation, and to one side of the colony you come across a flock of tents and of shacks. These are the temporary homes of the new workers on the soil—a thousand young men and women that a year ago were derelict somewhere in Europe, helpless, unrelated to any social organism, with nothing but a hope to urge them on. The memory of their own bitter experience was mingled with the inherited memory of the bitter experiences of their people. Life had become intolerable for them unless they could become a true and integral part of a complete organism. They were futile where they were, *luftmenschen,* impractical, useless to themselves and to the world. And here? Within a year they have learned how to care for an orchard, bring forth its fruits; they have learned how to plant, to sow and to reap. Their labor is more valuable than the labor of peoples that have been in Palestine, on the soil of Palestine, for hundreds of years. There, in

Poland and Roumania and Germany, they were dreamers. Here they are practical, shrewd, able tillers of the soil. They are in touch with reality here. You would think they were farmers and the sons of farmers these last ten generations.

But better you would love to talk with them because they do not speak like farmers at all. They startle you with their modernity. They have organized their field work as work is organized in modern factories. They measure a field in hours of work. They have graphed out, mathematically, the amount of energy this enterprise needs, or that enterprise. Is it any wonder that they can replace the old, unsystematic worker? Not only do they take over the care of the orchards. They so organize their work that they have time to cultivate their own gardens, plant their own tobacco. I saw nearly a hundred dunams of tobacco planted here, in Petach Tikwah, by the workers who had contracted to look after some of the orchards.

For this is what they mean by independence out there: that they shall learn to be independent of any outside source. Here, in the Diaspora, the Jew always talks of independence in a political sense. There independence means—complete self-reliance. That distinction alone teaches us that they have achieved the spirit of liberty while we are still trying to define it.

Does all this sound too rosy, too ideal to be true and natural? I cannot help that. I did not go out to Palestine to measure and report like an economist. I went out to see what is happening to the Jewish spirit out there. I went out to ask, first and foremost, what do Jews become in Palestine. And I answer that question by saying that they become freemen. Give them a chance and they will set an example not only to us, but to the rest of the world.

I could speak of these colonies, of the life of the colonists, and leave all else out, because it is in this life of the soil that I see the true, the significant transformation of Jewish life which must precede all else. It is here that you see in its most striking form the recoil from the barrenness and impermanence of the exile to the tacit productiveness and independence of a true life. Spiritually and socially and economically and politically, the workers on the land are the foundations of our Homeland. Without them the cities are mirages and without them there will not even be a true Jewish culture in Palestine.

Passing out from the colonies I would only say one word about their schools. I think that Palestine may be called the kindergarten of the angels, for surely there is no country in the world where childhood is more sacred, or more sacredly cared for. These little schoolhouses of the country, with their green fields for playgrounds, with their object lessons drawn not from charts and diagrams, but from the acres which their parents till, are the symbol of the spirit which pervades the colonies. There is nothing too good for the children, there is no sacrifice too severe. They will *not* have their children grow into dumb, incoherent toilers. They will *not* bring up a generation of European peasants, with the blunted mind, the narrow soul, the suspicious heart of the peasant. These children are taught by modern teachers, through modern methods. Their childhood will be happy, so that they will be bound by indissoluble ties to the place of their birth. Their minds will be as clear as the sunlight on the fields. They will labor, in later years, not because they feel a cruel destiny enslaving them, but because they will know themselves to be the strongest hope of the Jewish people.

And now you will ask me about the cities, and mentioning cities, you will ask me about Tel Aviv; you will ask me the old questions, the incredulous questions: Is Tel Aviv the miracle that they say it is? Does it really take your breath away? Is it the wonder of that world, the Paris of Palestine, the city that sprang out of nothing, as it were, over night? It is everything that they have said—it is more than they have said. But I cannot speak about the cities and the industries and the commerce of Palestine. I will say again that I was on a honeymoon in Palestine, and did not talk finance and business. I did not talk of feasibility, I did not talk of economic construction. Strange as it will sound to you, all this seemed secondary to me, even from the purely practical point of view. There are men who tell you, rightly, that Palestine needs funds, Palestine needs men, Palestine needs discipline. But there is one thing that they seldom mention: the one thing that precedes all these, makes them possible, as it makes all things possible, is love.

Is Palestine a land that can be loved, loved intensely and joyously and creatively? If it be this, there is nothing impossible, and technical methods are trivialities. And to this all-important, this conclusive question, the answer is a deep and passionate "Yes!" If Zionists have been practical, they have been practical in a sense which economics is still too elementary to understand: they have been practical because they have touched the innermost creative springs. Where there is love, there is not the word impossible. And Palestine spoke to me of love, not of *nadan*.

And perhaps you will question me again, asking: "What part have we had in this creation? How does this belong to us? What are the channels that bind us to the Homeland, so that we can send our spirit on ahead of us?" I say, until the day when you can go there—and may that day come soon, as I hope the day will come soon when I will return there for good—until that day learn to love Palestine as you love nothing else. Learn to understand that she has given you everything in the past, that she will give you everything in the future. If there is any dignity, true dignity, in Jewish life, if the word Jew carries with it a sense of ancient and incorruptible worth, if it implies not only inherited greatness, but greatness of today and greatness of time to come, it is by virtue of the infinite bounty of the Homeland. It is ours, as the body is the soul's. As speech implies the tongue and as sight implies the eye, so does Judaism imply Palestine.

And we Jews have been starved of love these many centuries. We are a people of mercy and tenderness, and that which it was meant we should love was torn out of our life. The suppressed emotion, the tenderness denied and thwarted, has eaten inwards, finding no natural outlet. That which we should have brooded over, fondled, sung to, was, instead of a reality, a legend and a name. Today it is coming back to us, and we are half afraid that it is an illusion, one of the countless visions that have deceived us over and over again. I say, do not be afraid. Open your hearts wide. What you have sought these many years—the vague unrest, the troubled longing, the hunger for sacrifice and service for something beyond the reach of temporal pains and complications—you have found in Palestine.

I will remember for ever the morning that I went up for the first time on Mount Scopus, to see the foundations of the Hebrew University and to speak with those who were engaged on the building. The masons were at work and in the still early morning the ringing of the hammers and chisels sounded, it seemed to me, across the whole of the awakening city. There were men already at work in the half finished workrooms, men working with their brains, as they were working with their hands. I thought that from them, too, working silently, a sound audible only to the heart, went forth, went out in great circles, to the city and the world. It went out, a message in a language that we do not understand as yet, but which we are learning in fitful and irregular intervals. And as the city of Jerusalem stirred in the first hours of that summer morning, so I felt the whole of Jewry stirring too, in an awakening, in a realization of its strength. Hope was added in that hour to memory. To the strength which has enabled us to endure, was added the promise of strength to create, and the measure of our creation shall be as the measure of our suffering. This is the message which is sounding out of Palestine: "God who made you mighty, will make you mightier yet."

By permission of *The New Palestine.*

DOLLAR CHASING

ROE FULKERSON

Roe Fulkerson, who was born in Maryland, Tennessee, in 1870, is a retired optician, who is more widely known as a newspaper syndicate feature writer and a toastmaster and occasional speaker.

The occasion of the present speech was the International Convention of Kiwanis—Mr. Fulkerson is the editorial writer of the Kiwanis Magazine—in Denver, June 1924.

Dearly Beloved: The sermon today will be on the topic of dollar chasing. The text is taken from the first verse of the first chapter of the Gospel of Common Sense, which reads as follows: "What does it profit a man if he gain the whole world and leave a rich widow?"

At the time of the World War, our friends on the other side said that we were a race of dollar chasers. The charge has just enough of truth in it to make us resent it bitterly.

Students of physiognomy say that we are the saddest faced nation in the world. We see a smiling face about as often as we see a fire engine house for rent. Notice the faces of the people you pass in the street; it is very unusual to meet a man who is smiling. We have deep horizontal furrows in our foreheads, three vertical cuts between our eyebrows and two deep curves from nose to chin, which put our mouths in parentheses. Our expressions indicate to the casual observer that each of us has a porous plaster which is peeling. Our faces look like the rough side of a wash board.

We race through life. It is a race between us and a time table, a race between us and a clock, a race between us and a speedometer, a race between us and a budget, a race between us and a bank book, a race between us and bogie. Other nations do not race. The Italian stops his work to sing an aria. The Englishman stops for his cup of tea. The Mexican stops for a bull fight or a chicken fight, and the Frenchman stops for any woman who passes. But the man of this continent hurries on as though ridden by Sailbad, the Sinner's Old man of the Sea. We are all as serious as a barber shaving a corpse. We ought to be ashamed to look a new born baby in the eye when we think of what we have done to the world before it got here.

This winter I had the pleasure of spending a few weeks in Florida. In the winter months every county in the state of Florida produces sixty seven million boxes of citrus fruit, and I can prove it by the Chamber of Commerce report of that county. For every orange which blossoms, a northern visitor comes to see it ripen. Hotels and boarding houses are filled with visitors, but ninety-nine out of every hundred of them are too old to do anything but sit around on the verandahs and listen to their own arteries harden. Most of them are old enough to remember having heard Blind Tom play the piano. Their digestive tracts will not assimilate the citrus fruits they come to eat; their lumbago will not permit them to climb in and out of the rubber neck wagons in which they hoped to see the country, the low lands keep them in the house on account of their rheumatism, and their neuralgia will not permit them to open the windows to enjoy the wonderful Florida climate. They waited too long before they came.

In colder climates they ran prosperous offices, stores, and factories. They piled dollar on dollar. All their lives they looked forward to the day they could retire and enjoy their money. But each time they added up the list of bonds and mortgages and figures in the little bank book, they decided to wait just a few years longer. At last they lay on a sick bed, with four flat tires, a carbon knock, and a couple of valve taps. The doctor told them the only cure was a vacation.

All their lives they had been slaves to a little sheepskin-covered bank book. In their race between their health and the figures in that dirty little book, they lost their chance at happiness. A goodly share of their dollars supports a doctor and a couple of trained nurses. Do you know that the letters M.D. which come after a doctor's name stands for "mean disposition"? Doctors travel in devious paths. There are allo-paths, homeo-paths, osteo-paths, psycho-paths, and half-a-dozen other by-paths, which, like the paths of glory, lead but to the grave. I have scriptural authority for that statement. In the book of Chronicles we read, "Yet in his disease Asa sought not the Lord, but the physicians. And Asa rested with his Fathers."

We all hurry, hurry, hurry. We all put on dog and put off the installment men. A teacher asked a small boy what Sir Walter Raleigh said to the beautiful queen when he laid his cloak on the muddy road for her to walk over. With a moment's hesitation the boy replied, "He said 'Step on it kid! Step on it!'" This is the tendency of the times on this continent. We have come to believe that when a savage puts on a pair of breeches and learns to love a dollar he is civilized.

You men remember in your own early life when you bought a Why Pay Rent and gave the realtor a wheelbarrow full of notes for it? You had only a humble Ford, but you and your wife were the happiest people in the world. That was in the days when the lovers' look of languor had not given way to the placidity of possession. You stayed home every night, and you and your wife and the kids lived a fairy tale. Prosperity came and with it two cars, several clubs, mah jong, and very little of each other's society. Anything which costs a man the society of his wife and children is not success. Yet the hurry of modern life costs many of us just that. If you do not believe me, ask your wife if she would rather have a husband, or be married to an inexhaustible supply company? We all rush through the world like a bicycle cop and a joy rider, racing for a ten-dollar purse.

The mother-in-law of a busy business man died. His wife, of course, had to go to the home town for the funeral. The man agreed to see that his several kids were put to bed the night she was gone. On her return she asked if he had had any trouble. "Only the little red-headed one," he answered. "I had to lick her before she would go to bed." "Why John," replied his wife. "That is not our child. She lives across the street."

Many young men pay installments on the engagement ring when they need the money for the baby buggy. Men have changed themselves into horses. We work like a horse and live like a horse. We hustle down stairs and eat our breakfast behind the morning paper. We rush to business and work like a horse till noon. Then, still imitating a horse and his nose bag, we eat in harness at a chair-arm lunch room. Back to business, we work till five o'clock; at home again, we eat our dinners behind the afternoon paper. After dinner we are too tired to go out, so we give the wife and kiddies a dollar to go to the movies while we drop into bed too tired to sleep. So we toss and think of the fluctuating price of the commodity in which we deal.

So we go day after day, week after week, month after month, and year after year, till some night, as we come home, a little boy rushes up and, throwing his arms around us, says, "Grandfather, congratulations on your birthday!" In the dining room we find a cake with sixty-five candles on it. Then for the first time we ask ourselves the question, "Where has my life gone?" No joy, no lilting laughter, no fun; just work, work, work! When we realize this, we begin to slip. It is not long till the Kiwanis undertaker hangs a bunch of crêpe on the door, and the preacher stands at the head of the coffin trying to say something good of a man who kept his religion in his wife's name. As the preacher bows his head and prays, one of the four pallbearers whispers behind his hand to another, "Who was this guy anyhow? I never saw him at lodge!"

I know a man who once found a two-dollar bill on the sidewalk. That was twenty years ago. All those years he has walked with his head down and his eyes fixed on the ground, hoping to find another two-dollar bill. He has found 978 hairpins, 465 used theater seat coupons, nine lip sticks, one cork screw, and half-a-dozen garters, but he has never found any more money. He is now a humpbacked old man. In his stooping he lost thousands of smiling faces, hundreds of cheery greetings from his fellows, hundreds of blue skies with white clouds scudding across them, hundreds of beautiful flappers with school girl complexions which must be kept out of the rain, and the chance to laugh at antics of little children, fat men, and people with plug hats. He has missed much which makes life worth living, for the sake of a second two dollars he never found.

It is not my purpose to deliver a tirade on the evils of the times. I remind you of these things to increase your admiration of and interest in this organization which we all love. I want you to see how much Kiwanis has done to eliminate these conditions and to encourage you to get deeper into the spirit of Kiwanis.

We are taught to divide time into three parts: the past, the present and the future, as though they were three equal divisions of one perfect whole. In reality, time can be divided into but two parts, the Past and the Future. There is no present. What we call the present is but a thin line which divides the past from the future. Even as I pronounce the word "present," one half of it is in the past while the other is in the future. So we must look for happiness not in the present, but in the past or the future. The past is but a lot of memories; the future but a lot of hopes. We can judge the future only by the past. As we look back into the past, we will see that our moments of greatest happiness were not when we made a lot of money or achieved some great victory over our fellow men, but when we did some kind act which made another person happy. Your fondest memory is of when you did some kind thing for your wife, your kids, or friend. This being true, we must get future happiness through doing things for some other person. What we do for ourselves alone dies with us. What we do for others lives forever and is immortal.

The conclusion to which we are forced is that love and friendship, not money, are the really worthwhile things in life. Being loved is wonderful, but loving some one, Oh Boy! that is the finest thing in life!

Go out some morning when the sun is rising and every dew drop is a diamond. Pluck a spray of lily of the valley and inhale its fragrance. No perfumer has ever been able to catch that subtle odor and imprison it under a glass stopper. Watch the ruby throated humming bird, poised like a living jewel before the open throat of a flower. No camera has ever been made fast enough to catch these rapidly vibrating wings and reproduce them in a photograph. Down the lane a thrush sings his song to his mate on the nest. No man has ever been able to catch that low throaty warble on a rubber disc and reproduce it under a scratching needle. From the invention of the alphabet literary men have written thousands of pages of prose and poetry on the subject of love, yet any man who has ever stood behind a screen of honeysuckle on a moonlit verandah and held the woman he loves in his arms knows that the blamed fools did not even scratch the surface of the subject. Some things are too beautiful to be canned and reproduced at will. These things are love and friendship, the finest blessings in a world full of joy and happiness.

Kiwanis has taught men all over this continent the true value of love and friendship in the general scheme of things. The greatest by-product of our organization has been its teaching its members that they *can* leave business for an hour or so once a week, go to Kiwanis luncheons and there be taught to value friendships. Having learned this, they teach themselves that they can take an afternoon off now and then and go out with the wife and the kids for a picnic and let the red ants play ring around rosie through the meshes of his porousknits. No man ever belonged to Kiwanis who was not made a better husband and father. Kiwanis has humanized men. In its "underprivileged child" and other eleemosynary work it has taught them real values in life.

Kiwanis has taught men that to have success they do not have to be so hard they scratch the enamel off the bath tub, that they do not have to treat competitors as a laundry treats a shirt.

Less and less does the almighty dollar figure in the lives of Kiwanians. More and more do they realize that the things almost lost in the chase after dollars can be regained by taking a little time away from business while we are yet young enough to enjoy living.

So we are for Kiwanis and the high idealism for which it stands. We are for it because of its influence for good in the lives of men. We are for it because of its unlifting and humanizing tendencies.

But there! Enough! It is about time to put fresh powder on our noses and go down and meet the boat. A story, and I am done.

I do not want to leave this platform the way an inebriated gentleman left a New York Club.

He had badly over-estimated his cubic tankage and came out of his club with a flat wheel and a list to starboard. A taxi was at the curb, and as he lurched toward it the driver opened the door and he stumbled in. "Where to?" asked the driver. "Take me to one hunner and sisty, sixtysixty sis street," said the besotted one. "I beg your pardon," said the driver, "I did not get the address." "I said one hunner-an-ansity-sixty six street," repeated the passenger. The driver took his hat off and scratched his head in despair. Just then another man came out of the club and asked, "Did you see a souse come out of here, driver?" "I got it in the cab," replied the driver, "but I cannot make out where he wants to go." "Take him home to one hundred and sixty-six, sixty-sixth street," smiled his friend. The driver got on his cab. Just as he began to roll away from the curb, the inebriated one leaned from the window and waved his hand at his friend, "Goo bye," he called, "Goo bye, you durned ole elocutionist!"

I am no elocutionist, nor trying to be one, but if anything could make me one, it is Kiwanis and its work, bringing the

Golden Rule into the business lives of men. We all think of Kiwanis in different terms. You have your name for it. I like to think of it as God's work. I like to think that God looks down with a benign smile every time a Kiwanis club meets.

By permission of the author.

WELCOME TO THE SOCIETY OF CERTIFIED PUBLIC ACCOUNTANTS

JOHN ATKINSON

John Atkinson, substituting for the Mayor of Detroit, Michigan, delivered this address of welcome at the Detroit convention of Certified Public Accountants, September, 1924.

Mr. President and Members of the American Society of Certified Public Accountants: I regret very much, and I am bringing to you the regrets of the Mayor, that he is unable to be here to address you in person. I will confess to you that I'd much rather he might be here, because I didn't know until five or ten minutes ago that I was to occupy his position, and it isn't quite the happiest thing in the world to come before a body of men of your kind and have you expect a burst of eloquence, when the burst has only had ten minutes to get ready.

I want to tell you you are tremendously welcome to the City of Detroit. You may not find any landmarks if you have been here before. Those of us who have lived here all our lives have to get acquainted with the town week in and week out.

You know back in the early days of Detroit, we had settled down in a pleasant rut; every man knew the way he was going down town; he knew just what he was going to do, he knew pretty well what hazards would meet him, what he would have to overcome during the day, until along about 1910 somebody either a Good Samaritan or a man who will suffer through all eternity for it, invented the automobile, and to add to the enormity of the sin, somebody built a Ford. And since 1910 we have more than doubled our population, and we have just gone crazy, gentlemen, that's all.

In place of being the peaceful, good-looking city that we used to be, we are big, dusty, dirty, uncouth, ungainly, anything you want to call us, but with a tremendous vibrant personality that is trying to find its way through, and ultimately will make a great, big, beautiful city. Why, we spend more to clean our streets and alleys than years ago we used to spend to take care of the whole city of Detroit. We spend a king's ransom on our pavements and our schools; when you figure the millions of dollars for our schools, the millions of dollars that have gone into fire and police equipment, the millions of dollars that have gone into opening new streets and alleys, it is almost unbelievable you could assume the burden so quickly.

You know it is a peculiar thing about cities, but along about seven or eight years ago, we had 40 square miles of territory, and overnight our Council, getting ambitious, added another 40, and if you know anything about cities, gentlemen, the last 40 is a lot more insistent as to public improvements than the first 40 ever thought of being. It took us a hundred years to give the old 40 square miles water, gas, all these things, and within ten minutes after the next 40 had been taken in, they wanted what it has taken a hundred years to give the other fellow, and wanted it in no uncertain language either.

So you can figure that when John Lodge tells you he is very busy, he is. You know the present day view of a great, big city of this kind—it isn't any longer just a political snap to be mayor of a big city, just come in for an hour or two in the middle of the day and shake hands with a few friends, but you are on the job all day long, and ten to one, unless you have a covered telephone, you are on the job most of the night.

When you figure that the City of Detroit is a $2,000,000,000 corporation wth a million and a quarter stockholders, you just get some idea of what the mayor of a city like this has to do. You gentlemen are constantly running into just such situations in corporations where a man will groan and tell you it is terrible, he has a couple hundred stockholders, and it is a nuisance; they are terrible; he can't get along with them. Figure the man that sits in and handles a million stockholders and can't get away from them, that has to listen to them, and you get some idea of the burden that a mayor carries.

And in Detroit, perhaps the burden is less, and perhaps it is more, because we are in such an uncouth state. We are so busy cutting clothes for the child, as the suit he has today doesn't fit for him tomorrow, that there is perhaps a little bit more or less elasticity and we don't expect quite so much of our mayor as we would in an old, settled community that never had progressed and only had a few thousand population.

I am not telling you all this just to boast about Detroit, but I tell you I am rather inordinately vain about Detroit. I also confess to you, in its present condition, I don't know why Atkinson went so crazy about it. But if I could take you over the city and show you where the line was, and show you where it has to go, and take you back to those days when we started growing and we had a factory with 2000 employees, and we considered that marvelous; and yet, we know Henry Ford has 50,000 employees in the same factory, and we don't bat an eyelash. The whole system has changed. We widen streets, and when we think we have them wide enough, we go along and spend a million dollars trying to get them wider, and when we get them ready, we find we have got to widen them again. We have to do it. There isn't any denying the great prosperity of the City of Detroit has come in the main from the automobile industry, and if you don't run Fords, how are you going to get them out of the factory, and if you run them, God help you if you drive any other kind of a machine! I never knew there were so many Fords in the world until I drove a machine, and the minute you get out here in the rush hour, you think it is raining Fords.

But that is all nonsense, and may have been of interest and may not have been. I want to tell you you are tremendously welcome. I don't know why I should be chosen to talk to C. P. A.'s except that I have one brother who is a C. P. A., and I have one who is on the way to be a C. P. A.

I used to think the laws of our legal association made us the closest union in the world. That isn't so any longer. I bow low to you, the C. P. A.'s, the best union in the world. From all I know, nobody gets into your ranks unless he jimmies his way in, and I don't find any fault with you. You keep it as it should be. The Bar Association is in such shape they cannot control it. A man can be a lawyer and not belong to his association, but he can't be an accountant and amount to much unless he is a C. P. A.

I wish you all the best that can come to you for the Mayor and myself, and hope you will have a happy visit.

By permission of *The Certified Public Accountant.*

ADDRESSES AT A BANQUET IN ROME TENDERED TO THE AMERICAN AMBASSADOR AND TO THE PRIME MINISTER OF ITALY

SPEECH OF THE AMERICAN AMBASSADOR

RICHARD WASHBURN CHILD

Richard Washburn Child, American Ambassador to Italy 1921–'24, was born in Worcester, Massachusetts, in 1881. He is a Harvard Arts and Law graduate and practised law until 1917. After a year in war finance work he was for two years editor of *Collier's Weekly*. Mr. Child is known as the author of a number of novels, and of books and articles on world affairs.

The banquet at which this speech was made was offered by the Associazione Italo-Americana, at Palazzo Salviati, Rome, June 28, 1923.

Mr. President and Gentlemen: It is my privilege to propose a toast to the King and to the spirit of an Italy now stronger and more united than ever before.

I wish to express the earnest hope that my Country and yours will continue to stand together in upholding ideals which make men strong, instead of tolerating those which make men weak.

During the last eight months Italy has made an extraordinary contribution to the whole world by raising ideals of human courage, discipline, and responsibility. I would be unfaithful to my beliefs and to those of hosts of Americans if I failed to acknowledge the part played by your President of Council, Mussolini, with the people of Italy in giving to all mankind an example of courageous national organization founded upon the disciplined responsibility of the individual to the State, upon the abandonment of false hopes in feeble doctrines, and upon appeal to the full vigorous strength of the human spirit.

We have heard a great deal in the last few years about the menace which war brings before the face of the world. I am confident that my people and your people are willing to act together to contribute anything possible to reduce the dangers of war, but I hold the belief, and I think your Premier holds the belief, that worse menaces than war now oppose the progress of mankind. Folly and weakness and decay are worse.

These menaces of weakness often are fostered by men of good intentions, who talk about the need to rescue mankind and about the necessity to establish the rights of mankind.

I want to see leaders of men who, instead of teaching humanity to look outside themselves for help, will teach humanity that it has power within itself to relieve its own distress. I want to see leaders who, instead of telling men of their rights, will lead them to take a full share of their responsibilities.

I do not doubt that the spirit of benevolence is a precious possession of mankind, but a more precious possession is the spirit which raises the strength of humanity so that benevolence itself becomes less of a necessity. He who makes himself strong and calls upon others to be strong is even more kind and loving of the world than he who encourages men to seek dependence on forces outside themselves or upon impractical plans for new social structures. I do not doubt the good faith of many of those who put forth theories of new arrangement of social and economic and international structure, but they may all be sure that more important than any of these theories is individual responsibility and the growth and spread of self-reliance in the home and in the nation.

I do not doubt that we, Italians and Americans, have a full appreciation of the pity which we ought to confer upon weak or wailing groups or nations or races which clamor for help or favor; but I trust that even in the competition of peace or war I shall be the last to ever believe that weak groups or nations or races are superior or are more worthy of my affection than those who mind their own business with industry, strength and courage, and stand upon their own strong legs.

I do not question the motives of many of those who, feeling affectionate regard for the welfare of their fellow men, hope for a structure of society in which international bodies shall hand down benefactions to communities, and communities shall hand down benefactions to individuals, I merely point out that some nations, such as yours and mine, are beginning to believe that these ideas came out of thoughts which though easily adopted, are the offspring of a marriage of benevolence with ignorance. In any structure of society which can command our respect and our faith the current of responsibility runs the other way. The doctrine that the world's strength arises from the responsibility of the individual is a sterner doctrine. The leaders of men who insist upon it are those who will be owed an eternal debt by mankind.

The strength of society must come from the bottom upward. The world needs now more than anything else the doctrine that the first place to develop strength is at home, the first duty is the nearest duty. A strong co-operation of nations can only be made of nations which are strong nations, a strong nation can only be made of good and strong individuals.

When one makes the Fasces, the first requirement is to find the individual rods, straight, strong and wiry, such as you have found, Mr. President, and so skillfully bound together in the strength of unity. But if they had been rotten sticks you could not have made the Fasces. Unity in action would have been impossible. The rotten sticks would have fallen to pieces in your fingers.

Mr. President, what the world needs is not better theories and dreams, but better men to carry them out. The world needs a spirit which thinks first of responsibilities, before it thinks of rights. It was this spirit which you have done so much to awaken into new life in Italy.

Not long ago I heard a speech made by a foreigner in Italy who is used to dealing with economic statistics. He was trying to account for the new life in Italy on the basis of comparative statistics. I told him he could not do it until he could produce statistics of the human spirit. I told him he could not account for everything in Italy until he could reduce to statistics that wonderful record of the human spirit which in scarcely more than half a century has created the new Italy. I told him he would have to produce statistics of the number of Italians who in 1848 and 1859, in the Great War and in 1923, had a cause for which they were willing to die. I told him that I was always a nationalist before I was an internationalist, and I would go on being a nationalist believing in the spirit of strong and upright and generous nationalism, and believing, not in theorizing nations or whining peoples but in those nations and peoples who develop a national spirit so finely tempered that they offer to the world an example of organization, discipline and fair play, only because they themselves are upright and strong and can contribute valuably to international co-operation. I said to him that when he could produce statistics on human virtues and human spirit he would be nearer to understanding what made progress in the world. I asked him if he had figures to show the difference between nations which breed men who are ready to die for their beliefs and nations which produce no such men. I asked him to put his statistics back in his pocket and go out and talk to the youth of Italy.

Mr. President, the youth of Italy, as in any other country, are the trustees of the spirit of tomorrow. It is a fact which goes almost unnoticed, that the training of masses of youth in the spirit of discipline and fair competition and of loyalty to a cause, is largely to be found in athletic games. It is a fact which almost always is forgotten that nations of history or those of today which have engaged in athletic play are the strong nations and those which have had no athletic play are the weak nations. It is a fact almost neglected that nations which can express their spirit of competition in athletic play are the nations which have the least destructive restlessness within and are the most fair and, indeed, are the most restrained in their dealing with other nations.

Athletic games teach the lesson that every man who competes must win by reason of his own virtue. No help can come from without. There is no special privilege for anyone. He who wins does so by his merit alone. Athletic games whenever they are carried on by teams, teach the lesson that the individual must put aside his own interests for the good of his own group. There must be a voluntary submission to discipline and absolute loyalty to a captain in order to avoid the humiliation of disorganization and defeat.

Athletic games are not for the weak and complaining but for the strong and for the lovers of fair play.

Finally they furnish oft repeated lessons in the truth that often when flesh and muscles and all the material agencies seem about to fail, human will and human spirit can work the miracles of victory.

Because I believe in these ideals for my own Country and for yours, I offer through you, for the purposes which the Olympic Committee of Italy will set forth, a small but friendly token of my deep interest in the youth of Italy.

By permission of the author.

THE PRIME MINISTER OF ITALY

BENITO MUSSOLINI

This speech by Benito Mussolini, Premier of Italy and Fascist leader in that country, followed the address of Ambassador Child and is in part a response to it.

Mr. Ambassador: The speech which Your Excellency has pronounced at this gathering, destined to strengthen the bonds of Italo-American sympathy and fraternity, has aroused the keenest interest in me as an Italian and as a Fascista. As an Italian, because you have uttered words of frank and cordial sympathy for the government which I have the honor to direct. It is unnecessary for me to add that reciprocal cordiality is felt by me and by all Italians. There is no doubt that elements exist for a practical collaboration between the two peoples; all that remains to be done is to organize this collaboration. Something has already been accomplished, but the greater part remains yet to be worked out. It will not surprise Your Excellency, if I mention a problem, without laying undue emphasis upon it, which interests us particularly; I refer to the problem of emigration. I limit myself to the statement that the Fascista government would salute with satisfaction the day on which the somewhat rigid restrictions of the "Immigration Bill" should sufficiently relax to enable Italy to augment its emigration contingent for the United States; and that it would welcome with equal satisfaction the investment of American capital in Italy.

As a Fascista the words of Your Excellency have interested me because they reveal an exact comprehension of the phenomena of our movement. This is the more noteworthy inasmuch as the Fascista movement is quite complex and is therefore difficult for foreigners to understand. You, Mr. Ambassador, are a brilliant exception. In your speech, I may be permitted to state, is to be found all the philosophy of Fascism, and of the Fascista movement interpreted as an expression of strength, beauty, discipline, leadership and a profound sense of responsibility. You have seen, Mr. Ambassador, that notwithstanding the enormous difficulties of the general situation, Fascism has kept its promises made at the time of the march upon Rome. The time which has passed since then has been brief, and only a fool could pretend that our work has been completed; I content myself with saying, and in this I think that I find the authoritative consent of Your Excellency, that it has been initiated well.

I am sure, Mr. Ambassador, that all Italians will read with emotion the words which you have uttered on this memorable occasion. I ask them particularly to meditate upon them. That to which I have just listened is not, in style or in measure, one of the ordinary, conventional speeches. It is a clear and suggestive exposition of the conception of life and of history which inspires Italian Fascism. I believe that I am not deceiving myself when I affirm that this conception finds numerous valiant supporters on the other side of the Ocean, among the citizens of a country which has not our thousands of years of history, but which marches today at the vanguard of human progress. It is in this community of ideas that I find the solid basis of fraternal Italo-American understanding.

The announcement that you, Mr. Ambassador, have offered a crown of gold to the Italian who wins in the coming Olympic games, will deeply gratify all Italian sportsmen—and their number is legion, as Your Excellency knows.

I thank Your Excellency, in the name of the youth of Italy, who almost all, especially in athletic circles, wear the black shirt, and while I encourage the Associazione Italo-Americana to persevere in actuating its noble programme, I declare that my government will do all that is necessary for the development and consolidation of economic and political relations between the United States and Italy.

I raise my glass to the health of President Harding and to the success of the great American people.

SPEECHES AT THE PILGRIMS' DINNER IN HONOR OF THE RIGHT HONOURABLE VISCOUNT CECIL OF CHELWOOD

ADDRESS BY THE PRESIDENT

CHAUNCEY M. DEPEW

Chauncey M. Depew was speaking in his official capacity as President of The Pilgrims. The Pilgrims is a notable society of distinguished Americans which exists to strengthen the ties of friendship between England and America, in a delightfully personal way. The Society's counterpart is the London Society of The Pilgrims, who cordially reciprocate by entertaining distinguished Americans visiting England. The dinner was held January 2, 1924, and, as always, in New York.

Viscount Cecil of Chelwood and Fellow Pilgrims: In the course of our twenty-one years of activities, we have had the privilege of entertaining distinguished representatives from almost every branch of public service in Great Britain and its colonies—admirals, generals, diplomats and men of letters. This period, which is the span of young manhood, has been peculiarly rich in events and people who have contributed to the object for which the Pilgrim Societies of the United States and Great Britain were organized.

The English-speaking peoples of the world understand each other better and have become centuries nearer each other in these two decades. Our meetings were peculiarly thrilling when we met to welcome the missions which came to us during the Great War, and afterwards to the almost only one successful conference, the one which met in Washington to decide the questions of the Pacific and disarmament. But tonight is the only time when we meet to celebrate simply peace.

There have been periods in the history of our country when such an event seemed impossible. But some patriotic and far-seeing citizens and friends of President Wilson created a Foundation which should be applied to the promotion of the ideas for which he labored and stood. These friends of President Wilson threw the competition open in order to give the whole world an opportunity to attain the honor which would go to the man who had done most for the promotion of the peace of the world. The contestants were many and distinguished, but with singular unanimity the judges selected our guest tonight, Viscount Cecil, of Chelwood.

Viscount Cecil is an eminent member of a family which has occupied prominent places in the Government of Great Britain for nearly a thousand years. I doubt if there ever was a time during this long period, when a member of the Cecil family has not been governing Great Britain as Prime Minister, or active and influential in its Parliament.

I remember one of my visits to England. Our Minister took me to call upon Lord Salisbury, our guest's father, who was then Prime Minister of England. When I was introduced to him in the Foreign Office, I had the same sensation which, I think, all Americans feel when visiting Great Britain, and when they come in immediate contact with the events which preceded our colonial settlement and history. We were then all sharers in the great days and in the mighty events which laid the foundations for both English and American liberty. I saw before me Lord Burleigh, the great Minister of Queen Elizabeth, and the ancestor of the Cecils. There arose, naturally, a vision of the events, the statesmen, admirals, generals and men of genius whose immortal work is our common heritage, and who adorned the reign of the great Queen Elizabeth. Shakespeare, Bacon and subsequently Milton have illumined the centuries and are still the light houses of our literature.

We cannot help recalling the serious effort for peace among the English-speaking peoples which followed the war of 1812. The commissioners of the two countries met at Ghent, because in their judgment it was the only neutral place in Europe. This was demonstrated by the Burgomaster of the town when he gave a dinner to the American delegates and said in his toast that he wished them every possible success over the British. At the conclusion of the two Commissions' labors, the American commissioners gave a dinner to the British commissioners. The toast of John Quincy Adams was that this successful peace-treaty, which had just been concluded, might be forever unbroken. Its beauty, its mystery and its longevity seems to be due to the fact that it neither mentioned nor settled any of the controversies which had been fought for in the war.

Since then there have been many movements from both sides to bring these great branches of the English-speaking peoples together. The main contributor for many years was Washington Irving, who secured against the British reviewers from Walter Scott the acknowledgment that the British people would read an American book. Probably the most successful contributor was the poet Longfellow. He brought to the world the Indian romances which attracted the attention of not only English scholars and educators, but fascinated the imagination of a generation of English children. Then followed James Fenimore Cooper with his "Leather Stocking Tales." One result was that a rising generation of England thought that the Americans were Indians. One American told me of stopping at a country house on the sea, and that one of the old ladies said to him, "How we are blessed by the stormy ocean, except for that we might be massacred by those American savages."

The contributions of the unity of the English-speaking race by Dickens and Thackeray cannot be estimated. How much English lecturers, who have come here in multitudes and given us their messages, have aided in the great movement is a subject of dispute. One of the most valued and valuable was Matthew Arnold. He brought me his itinerary which had been furnished by his American manager. Mr. Arnold said to me, "I am an Oxford professor, and I have instructed the director of my lectures to put me only in university towns." "Well, Mr. Arnold," I said, "he seems to have misunderstood you. In the first place where you lecture, the only university is an insane asylum, and the only college in the next place is an inebriate home; but outside the subject on which they have gone wrong, they are remarkably intelligent people."

But, my friends, everything prior to 1917, when the United States entered the Great War, is ancient history. We entered then upon a new era. It was the comradeship of youth, when both countries were fighting under the entwined flags of their nationalities, and for the same ideals and ready to make the supreme sacrifice together for law, order, civilization and liberty.

When the war was over, and the great Council met at Versailles, the future of the world was dependent upon its decisions. A distinguished ex-Prime Minister of Great Britain said to me, "Now that you have come in with all your strength, the victory for the Allies is assured. The councils after great wars in the past have left in their conclusions the seeds for future wars, and I fear the same results when the Allies get together around the council table." But it could not escape in its deliberations the century-old animosities and craving for territory and power. One brilliant and outstanding exception, who wanted neither territory nor possessions, who wanted only justice and peace and who hoped to realize his ideals, was Woodrow Wilson. He represented not only his own convictions but the public opinion of the United States. If, to assist Mr. Wilson, our guest tonight had also been a controlling commissioner, the result might have been different for the world.

Viscount Cecil, as a member of the War Cabinet of Lloyd George, held the most difficult position in the most difficult period of his country's history. He was Minister of Blockade. The War and the Navy Ministers and other statesmen who represented divisions and subdivisions of the war machinery of the government, and were raising and equipping armies and furnishing navies to fight the battles, had their duties defined. But his duties were not defined; they were mainly to watch the United States. It was a most delicate and difficult mission. It required tact, sense and diplomacy to limit as far as possible the contraband of war the United States could furnish other neutral nations for Germany and Austria.

The United States was neutral and the great merchant of the war. Without causing any irritation or anger, he succeeded in diminishing the sales without offending the salesman. While almost all other nations were fighting or involved in fighting, the United States furnished arms, munitions, provisions and everything needed by the combatants. Many millions now due us represent in some measure the vastness of our traffic with the Allies.

And here, permit me to say that one of the most valuable contributions to peace and good-will among the English-speaking peoples, is the wonderful way Great Britain has met and adjusted her debt. And I will also say how deeply I regret the recent expressions of ill-will towards France on account of her attitude in regard to her war debt. I am sure the position of France is wholly misunderstood. France is the soul of honor and will demonstrate it. We have too many things of sentiment and interest in common with France, running from Lafayette to Jusserand, to permit any ill-feeling between our countries. But the enemies of the Allies were equally anxious for their supplies, and to prevent Germany and Austria from getting them, the British Navy maintained a rigid blockade. Holland, Denmark, Sweden, Norway and Spain were neutral countries and quite alert in securing contraband from the United States and profiteering by reselling it to Germany and Austria. It was the duty of Viscount Cecil as Minister of Blockade, to minimize that traffic without offending the United States, because the Allies expected, sooner or later, the United States to come in as a decisive factor in the war. When the United States came into the war, we had neither enmity nor irritation about the activity of the Minister of Blockade. His was a signal triumph in active war and a genius for peace. Since the war, almost every successful movement which has checked or prevented chaos and helped the distressed nations on the pathway to peace, has been conceived or carried through by Viscount Cecil.

There is a message in this morning's papers from one of the best known American observers in Europe. He says that the people on the Continent are full of hatred and desire for revenge, and regardless of consequences would welcome the breaking out of the war, and the only restraining influence of what would mean chaos is the solid strength and sane activity of the United States and Great Britain who are closely acting together for peace.

Peace is the one hope of the world. A recurrence of war threatens civilization. Nations cannot be reconstructed except under favorable economic conditions. These can be only had with peace. Production can only be stimulated by peace. Recuperation can only come through peace. The Woodrow Wilson Foundation has decided to give its prize for the most successful worker for peace to that distinguished statesman, Viscount Cecil of Chelwood, who is our guest tonight.

I want to introduce to you, ladies and gentlemen, Viscount Cecil of Chelwood.

By permission of the author.

SPEECH OF RESPONSE

THE RIGHT HONOURABLE VISCOUNT CECIL

Rt. Hon. (Edgar Algernon) Lord Robert Cecil was born in 1864, third son of the third Marquis of Salisbury, is an Oxford man, and has been Assistant Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs, Minister of Blockade, 1916–'18, a Bencher of the Inner Temple, and co-author of books on law and the church.

Viscount Cecil, of Chelwood, spoke in response to the introduction by the Hon. Chauncey M. Depew.

Mr. Depew, Ladies and Gentlemen: My first duty is obviously to thank your Chairman for the very kind and flattering thing that he has said of me. I was very grateful to him for everything that he said. I admit that there was one moment in which I felt a certain qualm of nervousness, when he began talking about lecturers from the other side of the Atlantic; I didn't quite know how that was going to end. But, fortunately, his courtesy got the better of his sincerity.

Well, I thank you most heartily, and I am deeply grateful to you for being kind enough to entertain me tonight at dinner. The occasion, joyful, as it is, has an element of sadness for me, for it reminds me that this is my last evening in the United States. I deeply regret it. I deeply regret that my stay has been so short. I deeply regret it for many, many reasons, but among them because it has made it impossible for me to accept the invitations which I have received from other parts of your great country, and particularly because it has been impossible for me to visit the British Dominion of Canada, which I should have very dearly liked to have gone to, if I could have possibly managed it. I have the warmest possible feeling for my Canadian fellow subjects and for their great kindness to me on the last occasion when I visited them.

But it would be wrong for me in saying that, not to thank you once again, from the very bottom of my heart, for your marvelous courtesy and consideration to me—the courtesy and consideration which you always show to every guest who comes to your country.

You know as well as I do that American hospitality is proverbial throughout the world. Indeed, I was thinking today that if you followed the custom that prevails in some countries and an adjective were given to you; like you speak of "La Belle France" or "Merrie England," I think you would have to speak of "Hospitable America." It is only for one reason that I don't describe it as "Princely," and that is for fear of unduly flattering princes.

And really, if I may be allowed to say so without impertinence, it isn't only hospitality; it comes, if I may venture to say so, from the genuine kindness of your hearts. I like to think that that great quality is more easily displayed in the case of an Englishman than of any other guest. I remember last year, when I had the pleasure of being here, I had the honor of being received by your late President, Mr. Harding, and he received me with that cordial geniality which was well known in his case, and was good enough to ask me how I was getting on and how I had been received, and I told him that I couldn't exaggerate the kindness which I had met with on all hands; and he gave other reasons, but he said, "After all, one great reason for that is that you are an Englishman." And I must say that if he had searched the whole language for a compliment or a saying which would have pleased me, he could not have found one better than those few words.

I had the great honor this morning of being received by your present President, Mr. Coolidge, and in the course of conversation he too expressed his great gratification at the friendly relations which prevail between the two countries. In some mouths that would be a mere banality, a platitude. But if I may say so, England and America have one additional bond at the present moment. In the case of our Prime Minister and your President, we have a man of pre-eminent straightforwardness, a man whose every word we all know we can trust.

When Mr. Coolidge was good enough to say that to me this morning, I knew that he meant it from the bottom of his heart. And so the relations between our countries are very friendly.

I was very, very glad that you, sir, in the brilliant speech you have just delivered dated that friendliness from the time of the Treaty of Ghent. I have always myself thought that the greatest title to fame that our minister, Lord Castlereagh had, was in the signature of that treaty. It was a very remarkable performance and one which shows that it is possible to make a treaty of peace that will really lastingly give peace to the countries between whom it is made.

But I think it has many other reasons. Your Society is one; the greatly increased knowledge that prevails, both in England and America, of the national characteristics of the other people, is another.

I can remember a time—it was just dying out when I was young—when the typical Englishman, as seen through American spectacles, was a haughty and supercilious person of not any very great value to any one except himself, and the typical American was a curious kind of caricature, a person of rude and rough manners, purse-proud and offensive and arrogant. I don't know whether any such prototype of the man ever existed; I doubt it very much. But certainly he is as extinct as the dodo at the present time. But beyond all that of course there is the racial bond; there is the fact that a very large portion of us come from the same stock. I am profoundly grateful that it should be so. And more than that, there is of course what has often been alluded to, the great likeness in our ideals and aspirations, the great sources of which are in our literature and our history.

Shakespeare and the Bible count for a great deal in the good relations between England and America. The language, of course, is another bond. But much more than all that is the point of view. It is indeed the product of all the things that I have tried to describe.

It has been my good fortune—or evil fortune—to attend a great many international assemblies during the last few years, and whenever I have found an American colleague in those assemblies, whatever purpose we may have entered with, however divergent our apparent opinions originally were, in a quarter of an hour we always found ourselves pretty much agreed—not because we had talked one another over, but merely because in point of fact the same arguments appealed to both of us, the same point of view was that which was recommended to each of our minds. I believe that that essential sameness, identity of point of view, is the thing that is really responsible for the good relations between our countries more than any other single cause.

I believe, too—I am bound to believe—that among the causes of that very fortunate state of things has been something which isn't quite so often mentioned as it ought to be, and that is the law. Nothing was more striking than the great success which attended the visit of the American Bar Association to England during the last summer, with Mr. Secretary Hughes as one of the chief members of it. I believe that it brought the two countries together as much as anything that has happened for a long time past. The fact that we find constantly that we do appeal to the same principles in the law, that even the same names are great on both sides of the Atlantic, that Chief Justices Marshall and Storey are just as great in England as I hope Mansfield and Blackburn are in this country, the fact that we appeal to the same authorities, that our principles go back to the same thing, that this great structure, one of the noblest structures that has ever been erected by the human intellect, the structure of the law that prevails in our two countries, comes from a common organ and appeals to common authorities—I believe these things have had an immense effect in bringing the two peoples in closer and closer relations.

Your Chairman just referred to the Blockade. I am glad that he has so pleasant a recollection of the incidents of those transactions. I am not quite sure that I was so conscious of its success in the way that he described as he was at the time that it occurred. But this is true, that for all the things we did, we cited American precedents.

Yes, ladies and gentlemen, I believe very much in the influence of the law. It has had a prodigious influence in moulding our national character.

All that love of precedent—which I personally am a hearty believer in—all that distrust of generalization, that insistence on the practical point of view—much of all that comes from the great and continuous development of English law from the earliest times, and the great part it has played in our history always. It has formed to a great extent that cautious, unenterprising, if you like, but after all safe point of view, which the British rejoice in.

I remember in Paris on one occasion, in the course of a debate, a discussion at the League of Nations Commission, a French delegate urged a particular course upon the Commission, mainly, he said, because it was so logical, it followed so symmetrically from what we had done; and a British delegate replied, "Yes, yes; and that is precisely why I distrust it." And that which very nearly terminated the resistance of the French delegate, so shocked was he at the observation, was greeted with temperate applause by an American colleague.

And hence it comes, I think, that we tend very much, in great difficulties that come before us, international and others, to seek, if we can, a legal solution. We feel on safer ground, happier, if we can approach our problems from a legal point of view, and I heartily agree with that way of looking at things.

I have been very much interested, both on this occasion and on my previous visit, to notice one particular example of that which seems to have considerable favor in your country. It consists of the movement for the outlawry of war, and I think every one of us will not only be attracted by the legal atmosphere which it conveys, but also will see what a fine conception it is that the nations of the world should combine to ex-communicate war, to abolish it from the whole field of international relations, to put an end to it once and for all.

These ideas must be to every thinking man exceedingly attractive, and I don't wish to say one word in discouragement of the conception. It appeals to me profoundly. And yet, perhaps because of the training as an Englishman that I have received, I can't help uttering, I won't say a word of warning, but a word of caution. It is right to have these aspirations to live at great altitudes, but it is very, very important to keep your feet firmly fixed on the ground and in the path on which you propose to go.

Still keeping in legal circles, in legal phraseology, I venture to remind you that in our patent law—and I suppose it is the same in yours—it is not enough to have a great idea or a good idea or to make a great discovery or a great invention—that isn't sufficient to secure the protection of the state. You must go further than that. You must have your great idea, your great invention, your great discovery, and you must show a practical means for carrying it into effect. It is in reference to that that I should like, if I may, even on this occasion, to say a few words about how this great conception of the outlawry of war may be carried into effect.

I have noticed one suggestion made, namely, that it should be made by international agreement a crime in the strictest sense of the word, a national crime, if any citizen of any country drives his country into war, and that he should be punishable by im prisonment or some other even more serious punishment if he commits this crime.

Well, I can't help feeling that that isn't a very helpful way of approaching the subject, because, after all, if a country is defeated in the war, the man who was responsible for that war is likely to be punished very severely by his fellow-countrymen without any new legislation of an international character. To be in a defeated country is in itself a very serious punishment. And if his country is victorious, is it at all conceivable that you would ever induce the victorious country to punish the man who, according to them, would appear to be the author of the glory of the war which had just taken place?

I can't believe that that is a solution of the practical difficulties which would be of the slightest assistance. But other suggestions have been made. One is—not perhaps quite as precise as it might be, but broadly, that you should first outlaw war, that you should then codify international law, so as to make it quite clear, if it be possible to do so, what offense against international law was committed by the outbreak of the war, and you should then have a World Court to declare on whom the guilt of the outbreak of the war really rested.

Well, I am not going to say a word about codification, but let me say that I doubt very much whether, however much you codify international law, you would ever be able to provide rules, precise rules, which would enable you to judge which nation had broken some specific rule of international law so as to be clearly guilty of the crime.

Take, for instance, the question of the seizure of territory, the occupation of territory, or demand for territory, the quarrel arising, let me put it, out of the possession of territory; consider the kind of arguments that are dealt with. There are racial arguments. Who inhabits the territory? There are economic arguments. Is it or is it not necessary for the economic welfare of this or that country? There are historic arguments. To whom has it belonged, and what has been the history of it? How has it come into the possession of a country? And there are always what can't be excluded unfortunately, strategic arguments, arguments as to the strategy of that territory.

I can't conceive of any international code which could be so drawn as to make it clear on which side right lies, where considerations of that kind have to be borne in mind. I am not inventing cases. Take the well-known case of upper Silesia, when it was divided between Poland and Germany. All these questions came up, all had to be considered, all had to be dealt with. Though I believe myself that a broadly just decision was arrived at, I am quite certain it wasn't the kind of decision that could be dealt with by strictly legal means. It was a question of policy, of expediency, of justice, if you like, but of justice in the widest sense, and not a matter that is open to purely legal discussion based on a code of international law. And so I rather doubt whether that would work.

Do not think for a moment that I am against codification. On the contrary, I believe it to be of great importance that we should proceed to codification of international law and elucidation of international law. There should be elucidation of international law in the first instance and after that codification as soon as possible.

I rejoice profoundly that the League of Nations should have appointed a Committee with the very purpose of looking into this question and seeing how far it is possible at the present time to proceed in that direction, and I trust earnestly that that Committee will be fruitful in admirable results; but I should be not saying what I believe if I said that I thought those results would be quickly arrived at. I am sure it is going to be a very long business, and I am afraid that when it is completed there will still be a very considerable tract of international relations which will not be covered by the strict provisions of any law, but which will have to be dealt with on broad considerations of equity and justice apart from any written rules that you can possibly lay down.

Still less, may I say, am I against the institution of an International Court. I believe that to be of the greatest possible value. I regard the steps that have been taken toward the creation of an international court as among the greatest things that the League has done. I believe that that court has been of the greatest possible value to the peace of the world and the good understanding of nations already. I believe that the really considerable number of cases which it has decided—I think there are some ten or fifteen of them already—are really a very remarkable output of work, considering the great youth of the Court. I believe I am right in saying that the Supreme Court of the United States did nothing at all for the first three years of its existence. Here is a court which has to deal with even more difficult and complicated subjects and which has already achieved a very considerable position in the world by its work.

I believe that a great deal of that work can be done long before you codify law. I believe there are a great mass of questions dealing with the interpretation of treaties, the assessment of damages, and things of that kind, which have been and can be dealt with with great success by a court of that description, and it is only right to say that so successful has this court been in dealing with these matters that it has already achieved a very remarkable degree of confidence amongst those nations which have appeared before it.

I remember very well a very striking instance of that in an Anglo-French dispute which came before the Court. The case originally came before the Court on a preliminary point, I think as to whether the dispute was really in its nature an international dispute, and it was argued exactly as you argue any other case before any court by the British and the French representatives. The Court decided in favor of the British contention. Thereupon the French advocate arose immediately, though the decision had been given against him, and said that he was instructed by his government to withdraw all objection to the Court deciding the main question, and to suggest that they should immediately proceed to the discussion of the main question. That, I think, is a striking case where a defeated litigant was yet so satisfied of the justice of the tribunal that he was ready to entrust a still more difficult question to its decision immediately. Indeed, I would go further than that and I would say that if codification of international law comes, and I hope it will come, I believe that the greatest instrument for codification, for elucidation in the first instance and codification in the next, will be the decisions of the Court.

I am a firm believer in the common law, in the law that is built up by judicial decisions, and I believe there is no safer way, particularly in the beginning of a system of law, than to get thoroughly trustworthy courts, get them to decide on broad grounds of equity the controversies that are brought before them, and then gradually to distill out of those decisions the principles of the law which are to guide you for the future.

But even so, and granting all this—and I hope that after what I have said I shall not be accused of underrating the value of the Court for a moment—yet I am convinced that there are a great many phases of international disputes which can not be determined by strictly legal, narrowly legal action of that kind. I am quite sure that in addition to that, in dealing with some of the main questions that divide nations, the question, to use the phrase that I think occurs in some of your treaties, of honor and vital interest which divide nations, many of those can only be dealt with (at any rate in the present frame of mind of the nations of the world) by a much more flexible instrument than the rigid court of law.

We must deal with it by discussion, by mediation, by appeal to public opinion, by a frank laying before the world of the respective contentions of the parties, and in that way, and in that way only, will you arrive at a peaceful solution of many of your difficulties.

I say very, very emphatically, if I may, to those who are anxious, as I am anxious, to see the outlawry of war, the final extirpation of war as a means of settling international disputes, that if you desire that, you mustn't confine your efforts to a purely legalistic point of view; you must look beyond that and construct machinery which will be able to deal with all disputes between the nations and not only with those which are of a strictly judicial character.

I feel very strongly about these matters. I can not help feeling that in discussing these kinds of questions we are discussing matters of vast moment and importance, matters on which the whole future prosperity, indeed the future of the civilization of the world may depend. We can not afford to adopt solutions which may be attractive for the moment, which will not turn out to be satisfactory in the end.

I have always asked, in all these matters, for the fullest possible discussion, the fullest possible light to be thrown upon every proposal that is made. We must go for realities and not phrases; we must understand exactly what we are doing. And I hope and trust that whatever proposals are put forward, we shall never forget that the matters in which we are engaged are of vast importance, that what we are after is not less than the establishment of the peace of the world, and that any one with the slightest imagination who considers what that phrase means, what peace embodies, what the want of peace means for the world in the future, any one who considers that will approach these questions not with the desire of the success of his opinions or the victory of this or that proposal, but merely and solely with the purpose of finding some practical solution of the greatest problem that has ever faced humanity.

For my part, I adhere most fully to what your Chairman has said. I believe this is a matter in which the British and the American people can co-operate most usefully. It is said in my country that peace is the greatest of British interests. I am sure that all thinking Americans will agree that peace is the greatest of American interests also.

Let us be frank with ourselves. It isn't only a question of interest; we mustn't be too afraid of being thought hypocritical. It is true that both my people and yours do care for something beyond their interests. They are idealists, and why should they be ashamed of being idealists? They do care for ideals. They are anxious to do something not only to promote their own prosperity or even only the prosperity of their country, but something also for the peace and happiness and prosperity of the world. And here, I am satisfied, is a great field for genuine co-operation between our two countries.

I am not talking for the moment about the precise machinery. Machinery is of value; I will not underrate it. But, after all, it isn't the only thing; it isn't the main thing. I am not considering now whether we can achieve our end by the League of Nations or by some other method. What I do say is, here is a common object which we feel, both of us, profoundly, deeply. Surely it must be possible for us to co-operate for its attainment.

I do not mean even an alliance. I am not suggesting an alliance. I believe it is quite impracticable, to begin with, and perhaps that is sufficient. It is like the old story of the mayor and the church-bells, who explained that they weren't rung for many reasons, the first one being that there were no bells. I don't believe that an alliance is a practical proposition.

I am afraid I go further. I think that even an Anglo-American Alliance to impose peace on the world, if you can conceive of such a thing, would be a dangerous and very doubtful enterprise.

To us, our aspirations, our ideals, are (and I think rightly and naturally) the greatest and best in the world. We believe that there is much that is common between England and America in those ideals. But you can't expect the rest of the world to share that opinion, and the attempt to enforce the ideals of any kind of civilization, whether it is German kultur or what is sometimes called Anglo-Saxon ideals, whatever name you may give it, will be bitterly resented, and perhaps properly resented, by the rest of the world.

It isn't a new Holy Alliance that I believe in, even though that might be a Holy Alliance in the interests of the highest form of democracy.

What I have in my mind is a common peace policy, the exercise, the unfettered, the free exercise of both countries of their influence and their example for the peace of the world, combining it may be in this or that particular enterprise or this or that particular piece of machinery, but in any case working together for the common object which is the greatest object that they can have.

I can't help feeling that if we could work together on those lines, that would be a very inspiring aspiration for all of us.

I remember very well—your Chairman has referred to it tonight, and we all remember it—the entry of your country into the War. I was in London, of course, and when it was announced, I felt, and I believed with the vast mass of my fellow-countrymen, a thrill of thankfulness and gratitude which, for the moment, wiped out even the horrors of the existing war.

After long years, it was our feeling, Americans and British are again side by side, marching against a common foe and striving for a common object.

What we did in the War, with our Allies, history can tell us, and I think that history will say that no greater achievement has ever been recorded than that. If we could do so much in war, why should we not do even more and even greater work for peace?

Therefore, ladies and gentlemen, as my last word for the time being, let me say this: Let us go forward together, each in our own way, but having our common object before us; let us go forward in this great quest to achieve, in the words of the old prayer, "Peace and happiness, truth and justice, religion and piety."

From The Pilgrims of the United States.

SPEECHES AT THE BANKERS' CLUB, NEW YORK,

INTRODUCING JULIUS H. BARNES

JAMES BROWN

Mr. James Brown, a banker and a former president of the British Empire Chamber of Commerce, made this speech of introduction.

GENTLEMEN: Our guest of honor today is a business man such as we are. His particular line has been grain, the staple of the world. During the Great War he was asked to go to Washington, and there he became president of the U. S. Food Administration Grain Corporation. During the War and for a considerable time after the War he really handled the grain supply of the world. As an evidence of his activities and his reputation he was decorated by the Kingdom of Italy, the Republic of France, the Kingdom of Belgium, by Poland, Bulgaria, and Finland. He comes to us today, however, as president of the United States Chamber of Commerce, an organization of business men and business organizations that I believe is the largest in the world. A minute ago Mr. Barnes said that there are something like seven hundred thousand individuals who are members of the Chamber.

I have the honor to present to you Mr. Barnes, president of the U. S. Chamber of Commerce.

THE PROBLEMS OF MODERN BUSINESS

JULIUS H. BARNES

Julius Howland Barnes, former president of the United States Chamber of Commerce, is a wheat exporter who is also interested in shipbuilding and linen manufacturing. He was born in Little Rock, Arkansas, in 1873, but in his life interests he has been identified with Duluth, Minnesota, and Washington, D. C. During the World War, he was appointed United States Wheat Director. He has been president of large grain corporations.

President Brown and Gentlemen: You will allow me on a question of privilege to explain that I am no longer president of the Chamber of Commerce of the United States. I have a very worthy successor who I hope will not look askance at my record before him. It is a pleasure to be here with you today, because there is a philosophy of business which is the underlying motive in such organizations as the Chamber of Commerce of the United States and your own, attempting to influence and perfect the relations of business and government.

I take it that I may speak to you today using American illustrations without any intentional affront to national sensibilities, because after all we in America and you of the British Empire have so much in common in language, ideals and traditions which we may jointly claim, that we may treat these vast questions of the relation of industry and free government as ones in which we have a joint and vital interest. I take it that you will realize that here in America we are creating a new and virile race forged from the restless, ambitious and resourceful of all peoples, but after all the foundation of this United States rested on the 13 colonies that were typically Anglo-Saxon in their spirit, and particularly in their ideals of government. I take it that you will allow us to feel some measure of pride in that history of the British Empire which has unrolled for centuries as a record of exceeding honor. You, too, were a new race forged from many peoples, the ambitious, the resourceful and the enterprising, and in the 16th and 17th centuries you wrested the commercial supremacy of the world from the decadent hands of older races.

What it means to a new race with all the new energy and equipment which comes from the forging of a new people is shown in that era in your own history when at the same time that you were wresting this commercial supremacy and the mastery of the seas from Spain, you achieved a leadership in the finer arts even more striking. Shakespeare with his deathless plays was a contemporary of that Spaniard De Vega, who wrote the extraordinary record of 1800 so-called profane and 400 religious plays. Yet his name is scarcely even recalled today.

There is a laboratory here in America for trade conquest and the development of business and commerce; such a splendid laboratory as the world has never seen, one to challenge your attention and your admiration. Here are one hundred and ten million people, in effect 48 States, without a bar to trade and commerce which frontiers of separate peoples often erect; a people of perhaps the most uniform buying power that history has ever seen, with the narrowest fringe of relative poverty beneath and the narrowest fringe of relative luxury above; the laboratory suited for the genius of mass production, of large scale industry, of labor saving devices on which rests whatever accomplishment American commerce and business has been able to achieve against its most enterprising competitors across the sea.

Then we have here the foundation laid in a tradition of popular education which we transported from England itself—the universal privilege of the public school on which the literacy of a people rests. You can almost place the position of a country today in the social scale by the figures of newsprint consumption, the record of the transfer and dissemination of knowledge and information on which earning power develops and living standards advance. When we find the scale stands like this: Russia, 6 pounds per capita; Japan, 12 pounds; Germany, 45; Great Britain, 76, and the United States 150 pounds of newsprint per capita per year we realize what it means to have a people informed thus through the exchange of information and methods, the knowledge of customs, and the accomplishments of other peoples. In that knowledge rests the security of free government in a democratic people.

I take it that you will agree with me that this dissemination, this guidance to human effort, which has written itself in enlarged living standards, with a rise in intelligent earning power is something of very recent date. They knew how to make paper in

China a thousand years ago; they had the art of movable type in Holland five hundred years ago; but it remained for the service of modern industry and invention before we could achieve any such dissemination of information. Much that appears on the printed page will be misleading and inaccurate and perhaps sinister, but a people that read and study, that learn of the habits and attainments of other peoples will not be led far astray in a political philosophy. Therein rests the security of free government here and in your own empire.

There is an underlying philosophy that I would like to trace briefly to see if you agree with me on certain conclusions regarding certain pressing problems which rest on this quickened enlargement of earning power which we denote as modern business. I take it that probably the most significant advance which primitive man made was when he achieved the knowledge of fire and its control. It began to make him measurably independent of climate, seasons and geographical locations. It lengthened the working day. It changed savage habits with cooked food. As fire enabled him to replace stone weapons with melted metals, with tools for industry and agriculture, for war and a thousand other things, he began to acquire a margin of effort beyond that of daily provision of food and shelter. He learned to crudely master natural forces. He learned the windmill and the tide mill and water wheel. But after forty centuries of accumulative effort of this kind, trying to grasp something beyond that which was needed for daily living, the wealth of the world (which is this margin of attainment) was rated, on the recognition of this Republic in 1782, as one hundred billion dollars. Then in the one hundred and forty years since we have reached the record today of approximately one thousand billion dollars. This means the margin of things to own and use, in home, workshop and factory; the things which make life and health more secure, and add to human happiness and content.

If you will agree with me that this theory of wealth attainment is after all the conversion of favors of nature, the natural resource of field and forest and mine, oil and the energy of falling waters, useless and valueless until the mind of man shapes it through his hand into human use, then you will agree with me that an era which quickens this conversion, a race which achieves a leadership in this process, has a claim to substantial glory in human service, and cannot be waved aside as immersed solely in money-getting.

When we look at the reason of this quickened production, of wider living margins, dating from 1782, we find it starts with the peculiar fact that 1782 is the birth year of flexible power, based on the keen observation of a man named Watt, and his lifting teapot lid. From 1782 we began to equip man's effort with mechanical power. In 1782 we had the first practical steamboat in America and so slow were we to learn to harness this new energy in man's service that it was 44 years from that first steamboat until we had our first steam railway; so slow our progress, with no acquired knowledge and experience to guide successive inventions, that it was 41 years between our first telegraph and our first telephone. Compare that slow progress in these early days of the mastery of nature's forces with the miracle of the radio, developed in a single three years.

When we look back again and trace this trend more clearly in its component parts, we find this process of one hundred and forty years' achievement has quickened in fifty years, twenty-five years and even in the last ten years. The last twenty-five years are the years not only of the steam engine but the added energy of the combustion engine and then the added development of electric energy. This last twenty-five years is the era of the aeroplane, the submarine and the automobile, the combustion engine, motion picture, X-ray, wireless, radio and a thousand other miracles within your business experience and mine. These are the things which challenge our attention that we may forecast where modern business and modern industry will yet travel, along what road and why.

When we apply these tests, we find that increased production (which is the margin of living security) goes with the use of power; power production goes with wealth creation; wealth creation goes with earning and buying power; earning and buying is the mainspring which stimulates invention and industry, which creates new markets, new devices for human use. Then we see a new significance in the indices of the growth of power and its expanding use.

I don't wish to burden you with statistics but there are certain indices which give vitality to those trade currents and project their curve into the future. Fifty years ago they took the first census in America of the use of power in manufacturing industry and it showed at that time that the manufacturing industry of America was equipped with one-half horsepower per worker. The last census showed that each of the greatly enlarged number of wage earners was equipped with four horsepower. That is the secret which lies behind the fact that when they took that first census of power service in manufacturing industry our national wealth was 30 billions and after fifty years it is today 320 billions. That is the creation of man's effort aided by the service of power.

Or, if you will bear with me just a minute, I want to put it in another way, because I deem it to be extremely significant for a theory of government which I want to present to you in conclusion. In this last twenty-five years in which I have pictured this era of invention, the annual consumption of coal in industry in this country rose from 185 million tons to 500 million tons, but with it went the expansion of oil as fuel from 2 billion gallons to 30 billion gallons, and more than that, there went also the development of electric energy from 2½ billion kilowatt hours to 50 billion kilowatt hours.

The wide possibilities of altered relationship that exist in these sources of power with their peculiar significance to industry are shown in the tabulation today of the power reserve of the world. The coal supply of the world today will last for 10,000 years at the present rate of consumption, but the oil reserves of the world will last only for 15 years at the present rate of consumption, without allowing for any new discoveries. However, the immense source of hydro-electric energy in this country is rated at

62 million horsepower and we have less than 10 million developed today. That is the field of potential possibility for the development of industry which must inevitably rest upon power service. There is a new significance in it.

In this I am not attempting to measure the ethical or spiritual or character values of modern industries; I am treating it solely from its material aspect. Industry which by its earnings provides all those securities of modern communities—parks, playgrounds, museums, schools, colleges, paved streets, sanitation—is an industry which is worthy of study and of respect. An industry, the earnings of which establish vast philanthropies which conquer epidemics by whole races not by single individuals, is one which is entitled also to the study and respect of the world. Great Britain and America are, in the estimate of the rest of the world, commonly referred to as "commercial" peoples. They are, and "commercial peoples" to me is a title of honor—because no people ever became commercially great that did not have certain qualities of character—the redemption of a pledged word, no matter what it costs, the scrupulous observance of contracts and obligations (and that is more important today as a commercial people than ever before). The day of the village artisan marketing his wares within a market of arm's length is superseded by manufacturing for markets nation wide and world wide in which buyers and sellers no more may actually meet but must trade on the character and dependability of goods and the redemption of agreed contracts.

I hope all of us in the business world will always challenge whatever there is of innuendo when the title of "commercial people" is applied to us, as being a title of honor by the very record of modern commerce.

It has struck me, in looking back over the history of the world, that commerce has always been the mainspring which has saved civilization itself. I was so struck particularly in the analysis of the recovery from the so-called Dark Ages, and there is a little story which business men have a right to appreciate. In the Dark Ages, when the civilizations of Egypt, Rome and Greece had been overwhelmed and the known world had reverted almost to utter barbarism, when science and medicine were prostrate, until three quarters of the students at Oxford died and a quarter to a half of the entire population of England perished in a plague which today would be inexcusable in the light of the knowledge of medicine and science which we possess; when people huddled around a feudal castle in such utter misery that there was almost a total extinguishment of any flame of knowledge except that which the church kept barely alive; when religion became a superstition; when fast days became the universal custom of peoples in Europe, and fast days with its rule against flesh created a demand for fish, difficult to satisfy inland because of the lack of refrigeration. Then some ingenious Dutchman found a way to dry the herring and thus transport it into the interior of Europe. The British were quick to value it, the seas began to swarm with carriers, ships following the flow of the herring into the Baltic and seeking commerce for the seasonable inactivity; commerce began to expand in the Baltic and in the Black Sea, spices and carpets, rugs and wines and a thousand other things of commerce. Venice, seated at a transfer point, in control of a passage over the Alps, became for three hundred years mistress of the world. The silt of earnings of commerce settled through all these countries; schools began to open; universities established; there grew more knowledge and enterprise and ambition until it blossomed in that splendid era of individual genius which is pictured by Dante, Raphael, Michael Angelo, Da Vinci and Cellini. Then came the restless energy which sent Magellan around the world, returning with only eighteen of the 140 sailing; in the voyage of Columbus, leaving his garrison of 44 men in a new world—men never heard of afterwards.

Those are the things which commerce did; taught men how to achieve; gave them leisure to study; gave the means with which to project their restless energy across the sea both in search of commerce and in that blind drive for pure science which has always been inherent in mankind.

If America today, this new country in which you have cast your fortunes, has become in three hundred years the custodian of three hundred billion dollars of wealth achieved from nature itself by this process of man's conversion, then there is a significance here which it would do well for all of us to study. There is a vast significance indeed when 6 per cent of the population of the world here in this country convert annually to human use, one half the basic natural resources of the world—coal, iron, steel, copper, oil, timber and cotton. There is a vast significance when this simple people, 6 per cent of the world's population, possesses half the railroad mileage of the world, possesses almost three quarters of the telegraph and telephone equipment of the world, possesses 90 per cent of the automobiles of the world, but there is more significance when it uses 50 per cent of the newsprint of the world, because there rests in crystallized intelligent public opinion the promise for a continuation of this process and for the security which must accompany it.

There is a vista here of commercial potentiality in the thought that one hundred and ten million people here and in our sister dominions to the north, of similar tastes and achievement, are leading, with your help, 18 hundred million other human beings who today live barely above the verge of barbarism; who have yet to learn the use of shoes and cooked foods and a thousand other things which we have slowly and painfully achieved in our progress. The factories of the world may soon run full speed for years. The automobile is a quick transporter which makes natural resources available where the large investment of railroads cannot yet be introduced—the radio, wireless, telegraph are the means of communication which place markets within the reach of markets—these are the things which build earning power, no matter from what level a people may start this social advance.

If you will pardon me I should like to refer to another index. This process of enlarged production per worker which is typically American and British, began, as I said, at the same period which records the recognition of this Republic in 1782 and at the time of the discovery of a practical service of steam energy aiding man's effort. From 1782 to date I want to visualize to you the progress in production per individual: in iron from 500 pounds per worker to 5,000 pounds per worker per day; in lumber, from 100 feet to 750 feet; in coal from ½ to 4 tons; in shoes from ¼ pair to 10 pair per worker; in paper from 20 sq. ft. to 200,000 sq. ft. per day per worker. All this accompanied by other industries moving in step led by the same methods of invention and labor-saving. This is shown when you consider the method of transportation which would be necessary to maintain this commerce and the increased production. For instance, last year the railroads of this country moved something exceeding four hundred billion ton miles with eighteen hundred thousand workers. If that commerce were to be transported on the method of 1782, it would take 70 million drivers and 140 million horses in this country alone—manifestly impossible. These things are staged step by step.

Invention suggests, industry adopts; invention resuggests and industry readopts. The most striking example of this method is shown in the steel industry where the magno-electric crane with two men overnight laid off a crew of 128 men in handling pig iron. Were those 126 released to unemployment? No. There is a fallacy in the old-world policy of restricting effort and output to spread wages and earnings. It is only by this magical method that we find the workers for the expansion of old industry and the establishment of new ones which invention readily suggests, and with it goes the earning power of a people which enlarges their ability to buy and swells their circle of possession. That is the secret why there are 15 million automobiles running on the hard-surfaced roads of this country—how we found the labor to do it. In twelve years the output of autos per worker rose from 1½ to 9–9½ cars per year per man. The secret is in cost and in the ability to produce and to earn.

With this material achievement come certain problems. We have the new problem of the status of women in our social and political commonwealth. The invention of the typewriter forty years ago introduced women into the business field where before that their area of employment had been deemed to be the school.

Working alongside of men they won their way to equal rights of citizenship and they have today an equal voice in the selection of public servants and the direction of policies of government, half our electorate reacting traditionally to emotion rather than cold logic.

We have the problem of the relative opportunity, age old, between industry and agriculture. Industries, opportunities have become limitless and thus attract the ambitious and the able from the farm or from the village. The shining example of a single man in a single generation by serving society through the manufacturing and marketing of an object of an universal desire better than anyone else, achieving in a single generation a fortune of a thousand million dollars, is a picture which is held out to the ambitious of this country and which cannot be paralleled by any attraction of agriculture. Farm leaders of this country have so far devoted their attention to producing agriculture products for a market of the unexpandable stomach while industry expands a thousand times wider as men learn that they can buy and possess the thousand devices suggested by invention. Some day we will have farm leadership that will see that if agriculture is to maintain its step with industry in the attraction of the youthful and the ambitious, there must be a way by which broad acres can be lifted out of food competition and put into the production of those things which serve industry and its limitless market instead.

We have the problem, the chief problem as I see it, of the growing complexity of industry and its growing reliance on government, and therefore the question of the proper relations between the two. The intense individualism that is inherent in the British race and in America I hope, is no longer possible. Government must put its hand in every pocket in the form of taxes for the maintenance of public service. There must be a way to find the proper relation between government and industry by which we can preserve that divine thing called individual incentive. National progress is after all only the aggregate of individual progress. We must preserve that individual thing which makes for individual effort and there rests the chief problem in this growing complexity of business and government today. We are trying in this laboratory of America a new theory of relationship. We do not believe, for example, that government needs to actually operate our transportation facilities which was the easy recourse of those older countries of Europe. We are trying the theory of regulation in the interest which will still preserve the driving power of individual initiative and attainment, and I believe we are finding the answer. How difficult it is in this changing relation of our commercial structure is shown, if you will let me picture just for a moment, that in ten years the tonnage of products of the farms of this country have risen by 6 per cent, but the tonnage of manufactures have risen 55 per cent. We establish a regulatory body that is supposed to adjust wisely and harmoniously this great change, this change in vital relationship within the last decade and I have an idea that we will succeed in doing it fairly and justly yet.

Take the telephone—why do we have thirteen telephones for 100 people and Great Britain has 2? Why do we find that in the United States we have 160 conversations per day and Great Britain has 18? Is there something inherently different in the enterprise with which these public utilities and public services are administered; between that which is owned by Government and that which is privately administered under government regulation? You can speak from New York to San Francisco readily, three thousand miles. Long and expensive research created a little device called a "booster" which operates 20 times instantaneously on the wire from New York to San Francisco and which is not today in service on any of the government owned lines in Europe. Can you imagine a Congress as a Board of Directors appropriating money for costly research, even though such research in private industry returns one thousand fold in the economy and service of these important utilities on which rest all our social life and our commercial success? It happens that these things measurably correct themselves. Earning power has created an investment power in this country. There is more and more ownership of great corporations through diversified small investors; the facilities of great exchanges make it possible for the savings of thrift to get a foothold in investment and gradually expand. The ownership of business in America is becoming widely distributed. So that there is more and more a feeling that Government itself need not and must not operate these great facilities of business. The ownership of all rests in the people themselves, and this will produce its own correction against unfair exploitation if such there be.

How vital it is that Government shall intelligently appreciate what it may do to discourage, suppress or stifle business, or to stimulate it, is shown by one shining example in the world, and that is Russia. At the Geneva Conference in 1921 pleading for international help and pleading their industries were prostrate, Russia made the official statement that this great agricultural country had sunk under Government direction to 12 per cent of agricultural implements production and 6 per cent of plow production as compared with pre-war conditions; this, a country equipped with coal, iron, oil, timber and idle labor. See how inevitably the law of economics reacts to wrongful Government direction.

Twice since the armistice this great agricultural country has relied on the outside world for food with which to fight its famine. Formerly the greatest grain exporter in the world, its agricultural collapse has been most spectacular. Peasants who were paid last year by a Government monopoly, which excluded from the Russian borders all competition of world buyers, as low as fifteen cents per bushel for the grain product of its farms, today pay $2 per bushel in the world markets for grain to sustain peasant existence. Lacking both initiative and enterprise which rest on fair opportunity, we find the farms of Russia scratched to a shallow depth with the wooden plow of forty centuries ago because the modern industry which should produce modern agricultural implements has broken down under incompetent Government administration of industry itself, and the first few days of unfavorable heat produces a crop collapse in a soil as rich as any in the world, but farmed, because of these reasons, in a futile and disastrous way. Government policies must be soundly projected years in advance and in harmony with economic law, or such inevitable disaster will follow long after the visible cause may have disappeared.

In our country we had a happy-thought proposal in our last Congress which greatly alarmed this country—the McNary-Haugen Bill. The Government was to buy and sell and manufacture until it maintained on a fixed relation certain basic commodities in accordance with a general commodity index. In 1913 it would have taken 750 bushels of wheat for a farmer to buy a Ford automobile. Today it takes 200 bushels to buy the same Ford automobile. One has cheapened and one has advanced. Think of rigid legislation or inflexible Government administration attempting to suspend the ceaseless play of relative effort for markets and production, which by the reward of economy or superior service is the very base of advancing living standards.

I take it that organizations like your own and like the Chamber of Commerce of the United States are the effort to find the practical device to stimulate public opinion based on accuracy of fact and statement and project that public opinion for the guidance of Government through its legislative and administrative offices. The old method of election is too slow. Two year expressions of approval or disapproval of a public servant by election or rejection are too slow and also too indefinite, because issues are so manifold and so quickly changing. Organizations like the Chamber, crystallizing public opinion, placing it in the service of legislative offices and administrative functions, with accuracy, care and restraint, the evidence of mature judgment—these are the devices by which we will work out this proper relation of Government and industry and preserve, in the public interest, intact, the driving power of industry which is building these living standards that reach into every home.

By permission of the author.

WELCOME TO THE RT. HON. JAMES RAMSAY MACDONALD

JAMES J. WALKER

James J. Walker, Mayor of the City of New York, delivered this address of welcome to the Rt. Hon. James Ramsay MacDonald on the occasion of the visit of the British Premier to this country, October 4, 1929. Mr. Walker was educated at the College of St. Francis Xavier and received the degree of LL.B. at the New York Law School. After serving as a member of the New York Senate from the 12th District (majority Leader), he was elected to the office of Mayor of New York City in 1925 and again in 1929. Mr. Walker possesses keen wit and is an exceptionally clever speaker.

THE welcome that is accorded to you today, sir, is as hearty and as sincere as it is unusual. If you had come to these shores merely as a tourist or as a visitor your own personality, the great office which you hold, would have assured you of the very cordial welcome you have received at the hands of the committee representing the City of New York. But in addition to that is the fact that your visit has a historic value, a mission that is filled with promise of a great and a lasting peace for all the world.

If there is one flaw in your visit it is in its brevity, and if there is any note of regret in our welcome it is in the fact that the freedom of the city might not find you free to avail yourself of it or to utilize it.

New York you know, and I am quite sure you are convinced that no place you may visit throughout this land will offer you a more hearty welcome than does the City of New York.

New York City, with which you are, I know, quite familiar, practically says to you, as it reaches up into the clouds, that in your welcome the sky is the limit. To you and your distinguished entourage, your delightful daughter, please accept from us the most cordial greeting that we are capable of giving. Please be assured that we are indeed proud of you as a visitor, and even more proud of the purposes for which you come and the hopes which we have for the success we are sure that you will attain.

By permission of the New York *Telegram.*

RESPONSE TO THE HON. JAMES J. WALKER

JAMES RAMSAY MACDONALD

James Ramsay MacDonald, British Prime Minister and First Lord of the Treasury since 1929, delivered this speech in New York City, October 4, 1929, in response to a speech of welcome by Mayor James J. Walker. The occasion was that of the arrival of Mr. MacDonald in this country for the purpose of cementing Anglo-American relations. Mr. MacDonald is a noted labor leader in England and a popular figure in public life. In company with his daughter Ishbel, Mr. MacDonald was welcomed by a distinguished gathering including Secretary of State Stimson, James C. Dunne, chief of the Division of Protocol, Major General Hanson E. Ely, Commandant of the Second Corps Area, Admiral Louis de Steigeur, Commandant of the Third Naval District, Sir Esme Howard, Sir Harry Armstrong, the British Consul General, Edward Flynn, Secretary of New York State, Major General William N. Haskell, Commander of the National Guard, and Sir Thomas Lipton. As MacDonald mounted the steps, loudest of the cheers came from representatives of thirty-nine Scotch organizations including twenty Scots who wore Highland kilts and represented the Robert Burns Memorial Association.

How is it possible for me this morning, by words to convey to you the deeply stirred emotions of my heart as the result of your welcome? I cannot do it.

I have come on a mission of peace. I believed, when I was still far away from you, that there was a desire in your hearts to bless the world by a common understanding between your people and the people of Great Britain, so that we together, you and we together, should give an example to the whole of the world of how to pursue peace earnestly and sincerely.

Through you, sir, and through His Excellency, the Secretary of State, who has been good enough to come down here and meet me, and through His Excellency, the British Ambassador, and myself, I think I can say that this morning nation speaks to nation. We are not individuals. We are representatives of our people.

We stand here this morning shaking hands, meeting each other, greeting each other, giving me the scroll of honor which you have been so generous as to give me, because you, representing the United States, I, representing Great Britain, feel that looking forward into the future we must be inspired by a new faith of fraternity, with a new courage to follow large and stirring moral aims and supplement all our material achievements by things that belong to the spiritual excellences of the peoples of the world.

Through this gateway, the gateway of New York, have passed generation after generation, millions of people seeking new worlds, seeking worlds that not only yield riches to their labor, but seeking worlds that offer peace, comfort and nourishment to their minds and their souls. America, the United States, is not merely a geographical or a materialistic expression.

My friends, I hope I may call you so now that you have given me this scroll of welcome, my friends, in the traditions that you will always cherish are the traditions of the exile, are the traditions of the seeker, are the traditions of the men and women who lifted up their eyes to the hills and looked to the west, and finding in the old lands the dead hand of tradition too strong, the hand of the past too powerful, set sail across the inhospitable waters of the Atlantic, seeking happiness, peace and comfort, not only to their bodies, but to their minds and their souls.

And, I venture to say, if you allow me to say so, emboldened by your kindness, your skyscrapers can soar high; your millions can mount up to untold numbers; your prosperity may go on by leaps and bounds, but, America, most precious of all your possessions, is your own soul, and I come here on this mission to meet your President, not to advance material interests, but to meet your President in order that we two great nations, powerful in the past, still more powerful in the future; we two great nations, who can look behind with pride and before with hope, shall shake hands and shall pledge ourselves not to any alliances—these belong to the old bad order of things—but shall pledge ourselves to common aspirations; pledge ourselves that our two flags, wherever the work of God is to be done in this world, will be flying side by side in the doing of that work; pledge, not to each other, as it used to be, but pledge to causes; standing side by side, straining our ears to listen to the Divine call, ambitious of nothing, competitive in nothing, except which is to be the first of us to obey and to carry it to successful issue.

I am sure that many of you have come under that genial spell of Michael Furness' book of "The Roadmaker." Ah, in the large and the high and the public ways of life, if one could give service in roadmending as the humble hero of Michael Furness' book gave in the ordinary ways of the making of roads!

Roadmenders, you and I together, opening out the ways for human feet and human aspirations through the coming generations, on and on and on; roadmenders, so that when our children grow up, and our grandchildren grow up and have to face the world, at any rate there will be one road clear, unimpeded, stretching right to the horizon, the road of peace and the road of international understanding inviting their feet to walk upon it.

That is in my heart; that is all I want to do. I pray for your prayers that it may succeed.

I have taken with me the good wishes of my sovereign, King George, who just before I left sent me that telegram of good wishes and good hope.

Mr. Mayor, I represent no party in British politics today. I am not here as the leader of a party or the follower of a party. I am here as the representative of a united nation.

We have a genius, we have a faith, ah, my friends, like the best individual among you, now and again we may have fallen from grace. No man or woman alive can represent himself or herself by purely a white sheet.

My country has had its shortcomings, but nevertheless, above them all, there always have been a few of us, many of us, who have kept the flag of the ideal flying proudly above every other flag. And as time goes on, as generations get more and more wise, it will be that flag that will remain flying and floating and inspiring the people who lift up their eyes to it.

I am here today representing the nation, and in the name of the nation meeting you, and it is because that is so I know that you have given me the hospitable welcome that you have just manifested in your streets and here.

Thank you so much for that scroll. I will take it away with me, Mr. Mayor. I will cherish it. My children will cherish it after I have gone.

And maybe, my friends, when a coming generation reads the achievements that will be done in the world under new dispensations the chapters of golden achievements may be headed perhaps by an extract from one of the very generous things that you have said to me in that address, that extract marking the change that has taken place, that extract used as a pointing finger for future progress, that extract which in any event will always warm my heart and inspire me to more actions of this kind than has been possible hitherto.

Thank you so much, Mr. Mayor; thank you so much, Your Excellencies; thank you so much, ladies and gentlemen, for the very cordial welcome you have given to me this morning in New York.

By permission of the New York *Telegram.*

ADDRESS TO THE UNITED STATES SENATE

JAMES RAMSAY MACDONALD

This address was delivered to the United States Senate, October 7, 1929. In soft, silvery tones that held the Senate spellbound, Ramsay MacDonald, British Prime Minister and Ambassador of Anglo-American friendship, declared in that chamber that there can be nothing but peace and understanding between the two nations for the future. A crowded Senate chamber and bulging galleries applauded the Prime Minister again and again as he expounded his theory for preserving peace, not only between Great Britain and the United States of America, but also among the other nations of the world.

Mr. President and Senators:—I cannot say that these walls are unfamiliar to me. I have been here before; but when I sat in one of those galleries, having been brought here under the wing of the late Senator Hoar, destiny never whispered to me that one day, before I "ceased from troubling," I should stand as I stand here and now facing you and receiving your good will and your honor.

I have come in consequence of one great event that I believe will stand up like a monument in history. The event was the signing of the pact of peace in Paris—the pact of peace in the construction of which America played such a magnificent and such an honorable part.

America united with France, Mr. Kellogg alongside of M. Briand, gave the word that renewed hope and renewed energy, which is encouraging us to gird our loins together with more determination than ever before and pursue the path of peace.

Where do I find the great difference that the signature of that pact has made? It is this:—

You signed it; we signed it; other nations signed it. Did they mean when they put their names, or the names of their representatives, at the bottom of that pact—did they mean it to be merely an expression on paper, or did they mean it to be a guiding idea in policy? We mean it to be a guiding idea in policy.

Speakers in our country and speakers in your country innumerable have said that war between the United States and Great Britain is unthinkable.

My friends—excuse the lapse—Senators (I saw in a paper the other day that an enthusiastic Senator had also forgotten how precisely to address a committee in the same way that I have done). What has happened, and what has made the great change in the prospects of peace, is this—that up to now a proclamation has never been made solemnly, with all the dignity, with all the authority and with all the backing that can be given when two governments and the representatives of two governments make it. I think, Senators of the United States, that declaration can now be made.

There can be no war; nay, more, it is absolutely impossible if you and we do our duty in making the peace pact effective, that any section of our arms, whether land or sea or air, can ever again come into hostile conflict.

Think upon that when we face many of our problems—problems of jealousy, problems of fear, problems that you and rising and successful generations put into the hearts of the old generation.

They all disappear, and in virtue of the fact that they have disappeared we have met together, and we have said, "What is all this bother about parity?"

Take it, without reserve, heaped up and flowing over. That was the only condition under which competitive armaments could be stopped, and we could create a public psychology which could pursue the fruitful and successful avenues of peaceful co-operation.

That is one of the results of this visit. Another result of the visit is that we have come to understand each other.

Ah, Senators, as long as you conduct your negotiations by correspondence over thousands of miles of sea, you will never understand each other at all. If these democratic days, when heart speaks to heart as deep speaks to deep and silence talks to silence, personality, personal contact, exchange of views by the lip, sitting at two sides of a fireplace, as it was my great privilege to do this week-end with your President—these things are to be as important as anything else in laying the foundation of an enduring peace all over the world.

I did not mean really to deliver you a speech. I am afraid that my remarks are rather developing into that. I really wanted to thank you—to thank you as the representative Senators of this great country and this wonderful people—for your kindness and for your hospitality, but I must say that in the building up of those ideas you and I, meeting together here today, must remember the tremendous contributions that have been made by other people.

We are not out for any exclusive alliance. You would reject it. So should I. It is not for the benefit of either of us.

I do not know what I can say, Mr. President, but you are overburdening me with your kind and good wishes. The only wonder that I feel is why have I been so long in coming over.

There are two functions that the Prime Minister of Great Britain fills. The first, he is the leader of his party and he is the head of a party government. But there is a second function, far more important than that—he represents his nation. He leads not only his party, but the House of Commons itself.

In the second capacity, Mr. President, I have come here, and I have come here in the second capacity because, deep down in my heart, there is a conviction that nothing will ever remove, that the many misunderstandings, small but so deplorably effective, that have been growing up and existing between us do not belong to the substance of the substance of things, but belong to the appearances of substance, and I have come, full of faith, to try to reduce misunderstandings to substance, because I know when that can be done the misunderstandings will be completely charged away.

In the old days when two peoples used to talk together, all the other peoples used to put their hands up to their ears and say, What are they saying? They must be conspiring against us. That was the spirit of war, and that spirit must be extirpated.

In these days when two nations talk together, it ought to give hope and confidence to the other nations of the world.

Especially when neither of those nations—neither you nor we—will form any exclusive alliances directed against the existence of the interests of any other nations or group of nations on the face of the earth.

Our idea is the free, open, intellectually and spiritually attracted co-operation of friends. We are not a criminal conspiracy to protect each other against policemen. We are a union of co-operation, a body—I doubt if there is the exact word in our English language—a co-operation, at any rate, of nations coming together, discussing together, living the open life, ordering their exchange of views, their common action, sometimes their conflict of opinion—why not?

Conflict of opinion is a co-operator in the cause of peace when sane and honest men express contrary opinions, in order that that sort of combination, that sort of co-operation—I do not like the word "combination"—that sort of co-operation, that sort of free, friendly relationship, might be established not only between you and me, not only between your country and my country, but between your country, my country, and all the other civilized and honest countries under the face of the sun.

And we must pay our tribute—and I do it in a sentence—to two great men who have helped on this work: first of all, M. Briand, that gay, genial, happy, humorous, eloquent man whose whole life has been devoted to the promotion of the cause of peace, and another, an old friend of mine, to praise whom was, at this moment is, to lay a wreath upon his tomb—Gustav Stresemann.

Many a story could I tell you, many a picture could I paint to you, of that quiet, steady, heroic man, standing surrounded by enemies, not only abroad, but at home, determined to play a perfectly straight game, determined to carry into practice the proverb that he who does not respect himself is respected by nobody else.

Thank you—thank you very much indeed—for the hearty reception you have given me and the patient way in which you have listened to me.

By permission of the United Press Association.

THE FUTURE OF THE SUPREME COURT

JAMES M. BECK

James M. Beck, former Solicitor-general of the United States, member of the United States Congress from Pennsylvania, 1927, was born in Philadelphia, in 1861. He was admitted to the bar when he was twenty-three, and after a successful private practice became United States District Attorney, then Assistant Attorney-General of the United States under President McKinley, and Solicitor-General in 1921. He has written many books, among them several volumes on the War and on post-war conditions, and is an orator of note.

On the occasion of this speech, he was the guest of the Pennsylvania Society of New York, at the Waldorf-Astoria, December 20, 1924.

WORDS fail me to express adequately my deep appreciation of the great honor that the Pennsylvania Society has done me this evening in making me its guest of honor at its annual dinner. Grateful as I am for the generous expressions of the preceding speakers, yet I wish that I could change this dinner from a too generous tribute to the living to a better-deserved tribute to one who since the last meeting of this Society has joined the "silent majority."

A year ago Barr Ferree, from his bed of suffering, listened for the last time by the magic of the radio to the annual dinner of a Society which he had founded and to whose success he, above all men, had contributed by his self-sacrificing work.

I spoke on that occasion, and I remember that I concluded my address by reciting Thackeray's "Mahogany Tree." Let me, in memory of Barr Ferree, repeat one stanza of that lovely poem:

"Evenings we knew,
Happy as this.
Faces we miss,
Pleasant to see.
Kind hearts and true,
Gentle and just,
Peace to your dust!
We sing round the tree."

No one appreciates more than I do how little I deserve the generous references to my career as a lawyer by those who have preceded me. I am especially touched by the letters of the President, the Chief Justice and the Attorney General. My pleasure in all these kindly felicitations is not lessened by this consciousness of my undeserving, but I will not take the edge off of these friendly expressions by too vigorous a disclaimer. I prefer to follow the example of Doctor Samuel Johnson, who was given an audience by the King. Recounting to his faithful friends his reception by His Majesty, Johnson referred to the fact that the King had been pleased to comment very favorably on Doctor Johnson's dictionary. Whereupon the ever-faithful Boswell asked Johnson what he said when the King thus praised his literary work, and Johnson replied: "Why, sir, am I the man to bandy words with my Sovereign? If he says my dictionary is the best in the English language it must be so."

None of the speakers tonight was as candid as one of my guests was fifteen years ago when I invited some of my professional brethren to celebrate the twenty-fifth anniversary of my admission to the bar. While I had not intended that there should be any speaking, my dear friend, William F. Harrity, took the chair and called upon the different guests to make a little speech, and each of them, prompted by the same indulgent friendship as suggested the comments this evening, made flattering comments upon my modest career at the bar. Finally, ex-Governor Pennypacker was called upon to speak, and with judicial precision and solemnity he said: "I am glad to join in this tribute to Mr. Beck. I have followed his career at the bar with very great interest. He is a striking illustration of how much success can be achieved in life with a very limited amount of ability."

What the late jurist said then is, I know full well, true today.

I can best repay your great kindness by saying nothing of myself. In searching for a theme suitable for the dignity of the occasion it occurred to me to discuss a subject, with which I as Solicitor General have some passing familiarity, namely, the

Supreme Court of the United States, and more especially its true place in our governmental system.

The subject is timely, for once again the Supreme Court has survived a real crisis in its existence. A distinguished Senator, leading a new party movement, made his chief objective in the recent campaign the impairment of this balance wheel of our governmental machinery. To this destructive proposal, at least twenty-five million American citizens voted an emphatic "No" last November.

Nevertheless, nearly five million citizens supported this radical proposal, and such a dissent to a vital part of our institutions cannot be ignored by thoughtful men, as nothing is more certain than that this is not the last assault upon the Supreme Court.

As all of our governmental institutions, the power and permanence of the Supreme Court, in the last analysis, rest not upon a written charter of government but upon the confidence of the people in its essential wisdom and justice.

This was pointed out nearly a century ago by one of the profoundest political philosophers of any age. In his classic work, "Democracy in America," de Tocqueville thus described both the function of the Supreme Court as well as the foundation of its power. He said:—

> "The peace, the prosperity, and the very existence of the Union were placed in the hands of these judges. Without their active co-operation the Constitution would be a dead letter. The Executive appeals to them for assistance against the encroachments on the legislative powers. The legislature demands their protection from the designs of the Executive. They defend the Union from the disobedience of the States, the States from the exaggerated claims of the Union, the public interests against interests of private citizens, and the conservative spirit of order against the fleeting innovations of democracy. Their power is enormous, but it is clothed in the authority of public opinion. They are the all-powerful guardians of a people which respects law, but they would be impotent against popular neglect or popular contempt."

To strengthen public confidence in the Supreme Court is therefore all-important. How can this be accomplished?

The cause of conservatism is ill served by assuming that any human institution is perfect. The Supreme Court is, in my judgment, the greatest and noblest court that the world has ever known. Of all features of our Government it has been the most successful. It is the final conscience of the Nation in matters of constitutional morality; and no fact is more creditable to the American people than that, in maintaining this great court in its integrity, the people have shown that self-restraint which is the best guarantee of the perpetuity of our institutions.

This great ideal of a "government of laws and not of men" has not been realized without a struggle. The Supreme Court has from the very beginning been the target of an attack by large and influential minorities.

There is this significant distinction between the attacks on the Supreme Court and those upon other departments of the Government. In a democracy, no department of government can escape criticism, but the attacks upon the Executive and the legislature have generally been upon the temporary incumbents of those departments, and rarely upon the institution as such.

With respect to the judiciary the reverse is true. The attack has rarely been upon the Justices as individuals. Only once has a Supreme Court Justice been impeached, and he was acquitted. While the Justices, as individuals, have thus been more exempt from personal attack than any other servants of the people, the attack upon the Supreme Court as an institution has been continuous from the beginning of the Republic. This persistent hostility, while primarily due to the unwillingness of a minority in a proud democracy to submit to the wise restraints of the Constitution, is chiefly due to the present *exclusive* method of deciding constitutional issues, whereby after a law has been enacted and acquiesced in, it is subsequently nullified, generally in the course of private litigation.

In this connection I venture to submit, interrogatively, two suggestions for public consideration. I express no definite conclusion, and my suggestions, only intended to excite discussion, are like Mr. Guppy's declaration of marriage "without prejudice."

If the Court is to continue to resist ever-recurring crises in its existence there must be greater public interest in its deliberations. Increasingly, it is becoming more and more a monastic institution, and the members of the Court are expected to be political recluses. As a result there is an ever diminishing interest in the activities of this most important department of our government.

Time was when the Supreme Court shared with the Congress the interest of the people. It was in the early days of the Republic the greatest forum of intellectual discussion, not only because of the exceptional ability of the great gladiators who contended in the arena, but because of the surpassing magnitude of the questions which were discussed and the intense interest of the people in their solution.

A century ago the great case of *Gibbons* vs. *Ogden* was argued in that Court, which involved the right of the State of New York to grant a monopoly of the right of navigation over the waters of the Hudson. The whole Nation was as much interested in what was called the "Steamboat Case" as the people were in the great debate in the Senate between Webster and Hayne.

Last week I argued for two days the counterpart of *Gibbons* vs. *Ogden.* The United States sought to restrain the city of Chicago from diverting into the Mississippi watershed the waters of Lake Michigan to the extent of 864,000,000 cubic feet per day. It was a clash of gigantic interests. Hundreds of millions of dollars were involved. Four sovereign States of the Mississippi Valley supported the claim of the State of Illinois and seven sovereign States, including New York, supported that of the United States that nature had designed the waters of the Great Lakes to flow unvexed to the Atlantic Ocean.

Measured by the magnitude of the interests involved, few greater cases have been argued in recent years, and yet only the Chicago press made even a passing reference to this notable case.

May I say, in passing, that the willingness of these great sovereign States to dispose of a great issue by the methods of reason and in a manner so quiet as to escape any public comment is one of the most striking demonstrations of the value of our institutions and the peculiar efficacy of the Supreme Court, of which I have any knowledge. Suppose France were to divert the waters of the Rhine from their present destination to the Mediterranean. Would such a question be settled by any other resort than to the sword?

I believe that the ever-lessening interest of the public in the Supreme Court is due to a too rigid adherence to the Montesquieu doctrine of the separation of the three departments of the government.

About forty years before the Constitutional Convention met, the great French jurist and philosopher had published his "Spirit of the Laws." It immediately became a classic and no people were more impressed by its political philosophy than the American statesmen of the Colonial period. In an age of almost universal tyranny, Montesquieu had searched for the true foundation of liberty. He found it in the principle, that "when the legislative and executive powers are united in the same person, or in the same body of magistrates, there can be no liberty. . . . There is no liberty if the judiciary power be not separated from the legislative and the executive."

When after the Revolution the thirteen colonies formed their own State constitutions, they wrote in large characters in each of them this principle of Montesquieu, and the rigid separation into independent departments of the great trinity of governmental powers became a political axiom in America.

These statesmen, many of them eminent jurists, failed to see what a great soldier later perceived, that the Montesquieu doctrine could not be wholly reconciled with the realities of government, for on the eve of the XVIII Brumaire Napoleon Bonaparte said:—

> "Notwithstanding our pride, our thousand and one pamphlets, our endless speechifying, we are very ignorant of political and social science. We have not yet defined what we mean by the executive, legislative and judicial powers. Montesquieu's definitions are false. In fifty years I can see but one thing that we have defined clearly and that is the sovereignty of the people, but we have done no more toward settling what is constitutional than we have in the distribution of powers."

I fear this is true of America as of France.

When the framers of the Federal Constitution met in Philadelphia in 1787, they, like Napoleon, would not accept the Montesquieu doctrine in all its rigidity.

This was so because the framers were little influenced by the spirit of doctrinarianism. They were not empiricists, but very practical men. They had learned a rude and terrible lesson in the anarchy which had followed the War of Independence. For phrase making they had a positive contempt. They were not concerned about Montesquieu's theories or Rousseau's social contract, but were greatly concerned as men of property to restore law and order. Hard realities and not impossible and generous abstractions interested them. They drafted a Constitution, in which there was not a wasted word, and which is as passionless as a problem in mathematics. Its mandates are as simple and direct as the Ten Commandments.

While they did divide the powers of Government into the executive, legislative and judicial, they declined to accept as either possible or desirable any such rigid demarcation as Montesquieu had advocated.

When the Constitution was submitted to the peoples of the States, one of the principal arguments against ratification was that the new Constitution did not observe the Montesquieu doctrine, and both Madison and Hamilton found it necessary in the Federalist Papers to argue that Montesquieu had been taken too literally, and that the new Constitution did at least observe the spirit of his great axiom. To do this required a very strained construction of Montesquieu's language, for the Constitution, with its complex blending of powers, followed neither the letter nor the spirit of the doctrine. Nevertheless his philosophy dominated the American people in applying the Constitution. The separation of the three departments became the great ideal and it has given rigidity to our Government, which the framers of the Constitution never intended.

Let me give several illustrations of the baleful effects of a too rigid application of the doctrine.

It has prevented any parliamentary government in the true sense of the word. Presidents have sat austerely at one end of Pennsylvania Avenue and the Congress at the other, and there is too often a lack of team work, due to the mistaken belief that each is an independent department of the Government. How can they be independent, when the Constitution has intermingled their powers?

As a result, Congress, which at one time discussed and determined great questions of constitutional law, no longer makes any pretense of so doing. The members, forgetful of the fact that under their oaths of office they, too, must support the Constitution in its integrity, and therefore preliminarily interpret it, pass generally without discussion any law, however plainly in excess of their powers, on the theory that the duty of interpreting the Constitution is not their concern but that of the Supreme Court. Unfortunately, the Supreme Court not only lacks plenary power to invalidate every unlawful act of the Executive or of the Congress, but, proceeding most conservatively, it lacks the disposition to do so except upon the very clearest cause. Thus a great deal of legislation of doubtful constitutionality—like the Adamson law—is placed upon the statute books. Moreover, the same idea tends to weaken in the minds of the citizen the true sense of constitutional morality. In the last analysis the maintenance of the Constitution depends upon the people. They, too, as in the earlier days of the Republic should guard the Constitution, for "eternal vigilance is [still] the price of liberty."

And yet the people will too often support any fad, however clearly it may transgress the Constitution, on the theory that, if it be unconstitutional, the Supreme Court in good time will say so. Thus the spirit of constitutional morality, without which our institutions may one day perish, gradually ebbs away.

From the beginning, the Supreme Court, obedient to the Montesquieu doctrine, has held that it could only determine great constitutional questions in litigated cases. Hitherto, this idea has been generally accepted, especially by my own profession, as axiomatic in its truth. The time has come in my judgment to consider whether it is an absolute or only a qualified truth. That it is a general truth I freely concede; for if the Supreme Court, independent of the ordinary processes of litigation, could be involved in every political controversy its prestige would be speedily destroyed.

In other nations the judiciary co-operates with the other departments of the Government and the Administration can always have the advice of the judges.

I recognize that the Constitution imposes no duty upon the court to give such advisory opinions, but it does not forbid such useful co-operation, and the great end of our constitutional development should be to bring the three Departments into closer co-operation and not widen the gulf that now separates them.

The question first arose in the Administration of President Washington, who was confronted with a serious question as to whether a treaty, which this country had made with Louis XVI, was binding when France had passed under the government of the Jacobins. Conformably to the practice of the mother country, he turned to the Supreme Court for advice as to what the Government's responsibilities were. Chief Justice Jay replied that the Supreme Court would not give any opinion except in a litigated case.

A little later, Virginia and Kentucky passed the first resolutions which asserted the right of nullification. The very existence of the country was at stake. Alexander Hamilton, then Secretary of the Treasury, appealed to the Supreme Court to join with the Executive and Legislative Departments in denouncing the doctrine of these resolutions. Again the Supreme Court declined to express any opinion as to the right of nullification and sixty years later a great Civil War was fought to decide it.

These two instances illustrate the varying conditions which affect the expediency of advisory opinion. In the first instance, no harm would have followed, if the Supreme Court had guided Washington in a concrete case, while in the second case, the controversy involved a fateful abstraction, and the Court could not be involved in such a quarrel without danger to its moral power.

In Washington's administration, to secure the opinion of the Supreme Court as to the nature of a direct tax, Hamilton created a fictitious case of a supposed owner of 125 "chariots" and the Government paid counsel for both parties. It may be questioned whether an advisory opinion would not have been a more direct and legitimate course. Today, many test cases are created to get opinions, which in other nations are given to the Government on a simple request.

About a century ago, the Court for the first and only time in its history gave an advisory opinion. The question at issue was the power of the Federal Government to make appropriations for improvements wholly within a State. President Monroe was of the opinion that it lacked such power.

He turned to the Supreme Court for an opinion and that Court for the first and only time in its history authorized one of the Justices to advise the President as to their views, which in this case favored the power that was in dispute.

Is it quite so clear, as we have hitherto assumed, that the Court should not thus co-operate with the other departments of the Government and thus be brought into closer contact with the people? At present, all our constitutional questions are determined in litigation. This method, undoubtedly, has advantages, but it has very great disadvantages.

The most striking illustration of the latter was the Missouri Compromise.

Congress in 1820 had passed a law limiting slavery to certain portions of the Territories. It was a great political settlement. Both parties acquiesced in it. Thirty-seven years later, in the case of a fugitive slave named Dred Scott, the Missouri Compromise was nullified by the Supreme Court. My recollection is that Abraham Lincoln expressed himself very forcibly at this invalidation of a law nearly forty years after it had been the accepted law of the land. No single cause did more to precipitate the most fratricidal war in history than the Dred Scott decision.

Take, for example, the more recent case of the so-called Commodities Law. (U. S. *vs.* Delaware & Hudson Railroad and others.) Congress had passed a law which required the railroads that owned coal mines to sell them. Suppose, fearful that its validity might be sustained, the railroads had sold the mines at a loss of a thousand million of dollars, and then ten years later, in a case between John Doe and Richard Roe, the Supreme Court had decided the law was invalid. How could the railroads obtain any reparation for gigantic losses which they had thus needlessly sustained? This great injustice was happily averted, but for a year its possibility hung as a heavy cloud over the business interests of the country and probably many timid investors parted with their securities to their irreparable loss.

The hardship of this situation was such that the Attorney General took the unusual, but in this case justifiable, course of suspending the law until the Supreme Court had acted; but it is obvious that the Attorney General has no such power, and the only excuse for its exercise in this case was that of reasonable necessity to prevent a possible and gigantic injustice. If I recall correctly, the Attorney General, who thus saved a serious situation, was our honored fellow member, Mr. Wickersham, who has so generously honored me tonight.

Let me cite another case. At the end of the Spanish-American War the American Nation found itself confronted with the novel problem of colonial dependencies. It was impracticable to retain them if the provisions of the Constitutions, which requires that all taxes be uniform, applied to the Philippines and Porto Rico. Whether the Constitution in all respects followed the flag was a very novel and doubtful question. If Congress before taking a leap in the dark could have asked an advisory opinion of the Supreme Court it could have avoided a possible injustice; but under our governmental method, due to the Montesquieu doctrine, Congress could only pass the law, take a leap in the dark, and await developments. Hundreds of millions of dollars worth of merchandise were imported on the faith that the law was valid. Some years later, the Supreme Court, with most of the judges disagreeing as to reasons, sustained the validity of the law in a case that involved the importation by an individual of some lemons. Suppose a contrary decision had been rendered and all who paid duties had then found that the law, which exacted them, was invalid. Who would make good the losses? To enact and enforce a law, and afterwards determine its validity is sometimes like closing the barn door, after the horse is stolen. As Mr. Dooley said, after the Judges had rendered their individual opinions, the plaintiff was observed to arise and say: "May it please your Honors, do I get my lemons back?" If the law had been declared invalid, think of the irreparable injury to thousands of business men?

Now that the danger of the La Follette attack on the Supreme Court is happily passed, is it not a good time to consider whether in this and in other respects the Court cannot be brought into more effective co-operation with the other departments of the Government and into closer contact with the people. Our institutions are not static. They are always in process of development. The founders of the Republic did not claim for themselves infallibility, and we, their successors, can profitably be as modest. The last word on constitutional development has not been spoken.

If Congress, having passed a law which awaited the President's signature, by a joint resolution signed by the President, requested the Court to give an advisory opinion as to whether the proposed law was within the competence of the Government, is it so clear that the Court should decline its aid? Its power to refuse such aid cannot be questioned. No law, other than a constitutional amendment, could impose such a duty upon the Court. Its judicial power and obligation are limited to "cases in law or equity." I recognize that if a bare majority of Congress could thus drag the Supreme Court into any current political controversy its prestige would be in danger; but if Congressmen of both parties, sincerely dubious of their power to pass a law, could by a resolution passed by a largely preponderating majority of Congress—say two-thirds—and signed by the President, request such advice, I am not so clear as many others that such an advisory opinion, under great and exceptional circumstances, *and fortunately resting solely in the discretion of the Court,* would be prejudicial either to the Government or to the Court. The Court could and would refuse, except where a clear question of power was involved in a concrete case and the proposed law was not a political issue in the partisan sense.

I recognize the disadvantages of advisory opinions. As in most matters of Government, the true question is a balancing of advantages and disadvantages. Generally, almost invariably, the method of litigated cases has the most merits and the least demerits, but why be blind to the latter? To confront the Court with a law already executed is often to impair its freedom of decision.

In Massachusetts, Maine, New Hampshire, Rhode Island, Florida, Colorado, and South Dakota the Courts aid the Government by advisory opinions and this is true of many European states. The Dominion of Canada and the Providence of Ontario also enjoy the system and an eminent Canadian jurist assures me that the results have been very satisfactory. The practice is not novel in our American Commonwealth of States. Massachusetts has had this procedure for more than a century and its highest court, far from thus losing its prestige and reputation, ranks second to none among the State judiciaries. One such fact is worth a thousand theories. I appreciate that my suggestion will seem rank heresy to many of my brethren of the bar and that at present it can only be of academic interest, but progress requires that we should always revalue our beliefs and customs, holding tenaciously to all that are good but modifying all that are susceptible of improvement.

President Washington, who presided over the Constitutional Convention, and was its greatest inspiration, was the first to request such an advisory opinion, and it is significant that the supposed impropriety of his request never occurred to him until Chief Justice Jay declined to give the opinion. Possibly Washington and not Jay, was right.

"Something too much of this." I cannot conclude without saying that I yield to no one here in my deep respect and admiration for that great Court, with which I have been connected as an advocate for 28 years, and in which I have argued more than 100 cases. It has always seemed to me as a great lighthouse, and through all the storm and stress of political strife its great lamp, like that of another Pharos, has illumined with its benignant rays the troubled surface of the waters of our political life.

In the last analysis, the attack in the last political campaign on the Supreme Court was an attack upon the Constitution itself, and the result gives us renewed faith in the perpetuity of our institutions.

The La Follette party assault reminds me of an incident that happened to me many years ago when I made my first visit to Switzerland. I was in the lovely valley of Lauterbrunnen. Shut in by towering mountains of eternal granite, it is noted for a wonderful echo. The four notes of the common chord were sounded on an Alpine horn, and as the tones reverberated from cliff to cliff they intermingled until they sounded like the strains of a majestic organ. Then a little brass cannon was fired. The result was startling. The smoke drifted across my eyes and obscured the snowy summits of the Bernese Alps, while the echo was so deafening that it truly seemed as if the mountains had fallen from their bases into the valleys and primeval chaos had come again. Soon the smoke cleared from my eyes and the reverberations died away on the distant snow fields, and outlined against the infinite blue, untouched and unimpaired, was the white summit of the Jungfrau.

Similarly, we had last autumn for many months a popular upheaval that for a time seemed to obscure our vision and deafen our ears with its terrifying noise; but as the smoke of the battle cleared and the noise of the tumult died away, there was outlined against the infinite blue of the future, like a snow-clad mountain upon a pedestal of eternal granite, the Constitution of the United States.

By permission of the author.

OPPORTUNITIES FOR THE AMERICAN BANK CLERK

ARTHUR W. LOASBY

Arthur W. Loasby, president of the Equitable Trust Company of New York, delivered this address at the Hotel Astor, New York, September 26, 1924, before the members of the New York Chapter, American Institute of Banking. Mr. Loasby is a graduate of the College of the City of New York. His early experience in banking was gained in Syracuse where he rose to be President of the First Trust and Deposit Company. In February, 1922 he accepted the Vice-presidency in the Equitable Trust Company of New York and later he was elevated to the Presidency.

I AM here tonight, feeling not like the president of a bank addressing a group of ambitious young men, but rather like a sort of graduate student of the American Institute of Banking whose experience and observations may prove of some help to you.

During my clerkship I was not fortunate enough to be located in a city that had a Chapter of the American Institute of Banking, but it was my pleasure to assist in organizing the Syracuse Chapter some few years ago, and I was its first president.

I am glad to be here. It gives me fresh inspiration and confidence in the future of this business which we have chosen, for you are the men who in the coming years will step in and carry on the tasks which we older men shall have to lay down. The very fact that you are enrolled in the Institute's courses is proof that you have much of the stuff of leadership—the ambition to get ahead, the desire to learn, and the will to study and work overtime to fit yourselves for larger responsibilities. You know, it is not quite the fashion nowadays to work overtime, and we hear all sorts of demands about time-and-a-half and double-time for extra work; but I fully believe that the overtime you are putting in now will pay you more than double later in life. And, gentlemen, these are qualities chief among those which your superiors are looking for in their search for the "man for the job." We are all looking for the man who is eager to take on responsibilities.

Within the memory of us all, banking has become a new business, and the opportunities it offers to young men to do things are enough to stimulate any man's imagination and effort.

Your chances today are far greater and infinitely more varied than were mine, for when I started in banking the average bank was likely to be a one-man institution. Its head was apt to be a man who made a success and a fortune in some other business and had decided that he would like to combine dignity with profit as a bank president. At least this was so in the smaller cities.

I well remember the stage of my career as an active vice-president of a bank, when the president of the institution was a man of the type I have mentioned. He was a man of a great many excellent qualities, fair-minded, kind-hearted, and most successful in his many business enterprises. However, in discussing with him one day my future with the bank, he assured me that, of course, I would always be regarded as the active man in the bank, but in the event of his death undoubtedly the directors would want some representative dignitary of the town to head the institution. This custom is rapidly changing, and more and more our large banking institutions are being headed by men who have a thorough training in the profession.

Today the institution is greater than the individual. The bank president has become just a nickel-plated cog in the machine, dependent upon the other cogs working with him for success in his office. The executives are men who have worked themselves up from the ranks. I do not know of one officer connected with my bank who has not gotten his position strictly on merit, and in no case has he received his position through outside influence or so-called "pull." The scope and function of banking are increasing to such an extent that new positions and new responsibilities are constantly being created. In the old days you waited for the man ahead of you to die before you stepped up. Nowadays you can look about you, take stock, stir your imagination, and set out to create a job for yourself.

If I were starting out again, and had my experience to guide me, I think I would study these subjects:

1. *Myself.* This banking business is a peculiar one. The manufacturer and the merchant have something tangible to sell—something which can be seen or felt or weighed. But we have to sell the most intangible thing in the world—service. And since service cannot be seen or felt or weighed, its measure of value is the spirit in which it is rendered and the little things which are the outward symbols of service.

So I would first of all study myself. I would try to cultivate personality and the traits associated with an attractive personality. You do not have to be handsome to have an attractive personality. Courtesy, interest, agreeableness, sympathy, fair-mindedness, patience, consideration of others, and so on, go to make up an attractive personality. I would remember that to every one who meets me in my official capacity *I* am the bank, and that whatever impression *I* create is the impression of the bank which a customer or a caller takes away with him.

An old friend of mine given to rather blunt comparisons says: "If the office boy is disagreeable, you can bet the boss is too."

I would cultivate personality, too, for the importance it has in my association with those who work with me. The man who wants to be "on his own" won't get very far. It's team work that counts; and I should want my fellow workers to be my greatest boosters and well-wishers.

2. *People.* I would study people, for the human equation is the biggest factor in the business of banking. Some people feel that they are conferring a favor on a bank when they do business with it. Many are secretly embarrassed when they come into a bank. I should turn all this into capital by so treating them that they would go away with a warm feeling about me and my bank.

I would study my customers individually, too. If I were at a bank window, for instance, I would feel that my opportunity was particularly great and I would make my customers feel that I was more than a clerk who took deposits or cashed checks. Their good words would come to the ears of my superiors fast enough.

The average man or woman is appreciative enough, and quick to give credit where it is due.

But I would try to do all this sincerely and intelligently. The teller who thanks a depositor as he hands back the latter's pass book always makes an impression. Remember that we are doing business with other people's money.

3. *My Business.* I have said a good deal about the necessity of cultivating one's own personality and of cultivating other people. But that is only a start.

Study this business of banking, just as you are doing now. I would know what it is all about, what it is for, and how it is done. Then I would look around, and at myself, and say: "In what special way can I fit into this organization? What particular thing can I contribute which will help my bank and help me?" Some of us are more fitted as specialists, you know, than as general executives.

I would take what I had learned in this training school and what I had observed, and I would put them together to see if I couldn't give birth to some idea which would be helpful and, as a consequence, would single me out as a man of mark. Don't go off half cocked. Be sure of your ground. The progress of the world and of any business depends upon the origination of new ideas which have a basis in experience and practicality.

We, who are near the top, are so busy ourselves and so close to our jobs that we have to depend upon you fellows who constitute our staff to help us think. Nothing pleases me more than to have someone in our organization present an idea, provided, of course, that he has put some mental effort into it. And every now and then some one does give us an idea which improves our service, or increases business or reduces overhead. For instance, not long ago a clerk in our Accounting Department sent to my desk an ingenious chart for determining the number of items that could be profitably handled on accounts of a certain average balance. This chart represented many hours of thought and hard digging; and, as you know the loss which a bank suffers through carrying "accommodation" accounts, you will appreciate the inestimable value that man's thinking was to the bank. Of course, it was not perfect, but it was a good yard stick for us to use. That is the type of man who is most likely to get ahead.

Perhaps you may think that what I have just said smacks of the intensely selfish. But it does not. The truly selfish man has no place in a bank or any other business, and will fall of the weight of his own importance. What I am trying to get over to you men is the necessity of cold, introspective self-analysis as a means of finding oneself and then of examining into the factors which will crystallize before your eyes opportunities for greater service that lie all around you. I say "greater service," for no man or institution can profit in a proportion greater than in the service which he or it renders.

The former misconception of the banker, a man who owned everything in town and was owed by everybody and was a sort of cold-blooded ogre who lived on the work of his fellows is being dispelled. In the correction of this misconception lies your opportunity. Of course, since Biblical days, the money lender has been more or less scorned, but our job is to convince the public at large that we money lenders are simply using the talents of others and have a trusteeship to reckon with, and we are most essential and necessary in the scheme of things and are human beings like the rest. The banker is custodian of the wealth of the community and the individual who makes possible economic and social progress by making one dollar do the work of many. Since the war, he has become perhaps the greatest factor in the present efforts to establish international harmony and an enduring peace.

The savings banks of the country are ready to reward any man who will help bring into security and productive use the millions of idle dollars now hidden in socks, mattresses, under floors and in the ground. The trust companies are looking for men who will help them teach every man and woman with property that they can render real service in building an estate and that they alone can insure its preservation for the benefit of beneficiaries. The investment bankers are looking for men who will help them induce the average saver to come to them for sound advice in investment matters, instead of sinking a billion dollars a year in fake securities. The commercial banker wants new ideas to help steer business along a safe and constructive course. Credit is so easy to grant but oftentimes so hard to cancel.

As both a business and a profession, we are one of the oldest in the world. There is no patent on the banking business, and competition is keen. There were bankers just as soon as men began to exchange the products of their handiwork. But it is only in recent years that we have begun to awaken to our true place in the world and to realize that no service is more essential or more "human" than that which is rendered by the banker.

We have recently seen labor come into the banking field. This is a most helpful sign and is a long step toward a better understanding between the banking fraternity and the masses.

So this is your opportunity. The men who are successful in banking today got ahead by thinking, hustling, and having faith. We who are at the head of our respective organizations are too occupied with administrative details to be alone the creators of new thought for the improvement of our profession. We need the assistance of you younger men and are only too willing to reward those of you who contribute the things which in turn contribute to greater service, and hence to the growth of our respective banks.

And so I say, in conclusion, with all the earnestness of a man who has been through the mill and who thinks he has grasped some vision of the future of our business, and who realizes the dependence of present executives on those with whom they work: Study, think, have courage and faith.

For up to today we have only scratched the surface of the possibilities of financial service, and those of you who go deeper into its possibilities will not only benefit materially but will have the greater satisfaction that comes from the realization of having contributed something to the happiness and the progress of your fellowmen.

By permission of the American Institute of Banking.

THE ART OF PERSONAL CONTACT

ELMER E. FERRIS

Elmer Ellsworth Ferris, author and professor, was born at Lamartine, Wisconsin, in 1861, studied at the University of Chicago, and was admitted to the bar in 1888, practising in Nebraska. He became sales manager of a large business enterprise and later its vice-president. Later he was appointed Professor of Salesmanship at New York University. He is the author of numerous books on this subject.

Professor Ferris's address quoted here was delivered before the New York Advertising Club, 1924.

Gentlemen of the Advertising Club: It is a pleasure to speak before you tonight because you and I stand on common ground. Sales is the essence of advertising. The gist of salesmanship is getting the other person to take your point of view and act accordingly. That is also the gist of what the advertising man is trying to do. Furthermore, this matter of judging and handling men, which lies at the heart of personal contacts, is just as essential a part of advertising skill as of sales ability, and so right at the outset of this talk I can confidently claim your interest because the subject itself ought to hold you.

Certainly the matter of character analysis is a vital one. Every day you and I are thrown into contact with men whom we wish to impress favorably. The art of personal contacts is a fine art—a valuable business asset. We all realize it, and we all wish that we were good mixers. We know full well that the ability to make a quick and easy adjustment to other personalities has a big social, as well as a big cash value. Not one of us but has often wondered whether there might not be some plain practical program for acquiring this fine art.

Now it is doubtless true that in this as in all other arts, such as music, oratory, literature, and the like, there are some men who possess a native talent. Some men are naturally keen judges of human nature. They are like born musicians. They do not understand why or how it is that they do it so easily. They simply do it. They are fortunate. They were born that way.

But in the case of most of us, if we are to possess this art at all we must acquire it. Thus arises the very important question "How?"

There have been a number of interesting books written upon this subject. Some of them have real scientific value. However, I shall not attempt to analyze any of them here tonight. For the most part they are too technical, too involved, for everyday use. I do not deny that a careful study of racial type, such as the brunette and the blonde, or of facial contours, the convex and the concave, or of cranial bumps, or the size and shape of the hands, or the color and size of the eyes, or the width and length of the face may furnish one with a certain amount of valuable data as a basis for judgment. But, when we come to apply it, we find that the cross-currents of human nature are so numerous that our man seldom runs true to type. Furthermore, we find that in attempting to apply these technical tests to a man —that is, when we attempt to "size him up" by means of a scientific process of character analysis, we become so involved in a maze of technicalities that we lose touch with our man. We become so engrossed with outward characteristics that we fail to connect with his inner self. Instead of getting next to him we stand off and classify him, and meanwhile we lose what we are after.

But this does not mean that there is not a plain, practical method of sizing a man up and adjusting our action accordingly. I am free to say that after a good many years of selling experience, I worked out a system of my own which I have found practical and effective. I am going to offer it here; but honestly, I do it with some hesitation. I do not wish to assume any superiority, but I realize very well that in the matter of methods of handling men, much depends upon the personality of the salesman. Sound principles always work when properly applied, but methods of applying them vary according to personalities and circumstances. I will only say that in my own experience the methods which I shall point out have worked very well.

I take it that all men can be roughly classified into two types of temperament, known as the phlegmatic and the sensitive. The phlegmatic man is inclined to be cool and deliberate. The sensitive type of man is more quick and impulsive. The phlegmatic man comes to his conclusions more slowly; the sensitive man more quickly. The former is more even in his moods and less responsive to outside influence. The latter is more quickly influenced by surrounding conditions. The former is more sluggish, the latter more volatile,—more subject to "ups" and "downs."

Now, while there is in every man a strange mixture of temperament, nevertheless one or the other of these types is quite sure to predominate.

There are two advantages in using a broad classification like this. The type of temperament is easy to identify, and the general method of handling is comparatively simple.

It is not a difficult matter even in a casual contact to determine whether a man is cool, deliberate, methodical, well nourished, or the opposite. I use the term "well nourished" because the phlegmatic man lacks that mental tensity which tends to produce indigestion and insomnia. His physique is usually well rounded, his tone of voice is more calm, and his expression more serene, his movements more deliberate. His contour suggests comfort and complacency. He makes you feel as if you would like to go fishing with him.

The sensitive man is not so, or, at least not so much. He is usually more spare, more tense, more impulsive. He is liable to tap the table with his finger tips and say "Yes, yes, but what is it that you want of me?" This does not suggest a fishing trip. He might scare away the fish. However, my point is that the type is not hard to identify.

Now, as to the best methods of handling these types. I think that they naturally follow as a corollary from our description.

The phlegmatic man is the slow starter. He is somewhat like a heavily loaded freight train—slow to get into motion. Logically then, he should be handled with deliberation. You can take your time with him. You can chat with him about current events; and if you have a good anecdote in point, one, for instance, about what the Irishman said to the Jew and how the Jew came back at the Irishman, you can safely tell it to the phlegmatic brother.

Not so with the sensitive type. He is the self-starter. He gets away quickly. He avoids detours. He should be handled with directness. One should be cool and self-possessed, but pointed and direct in dealing with such a man.

This sizing-up process should not stop with a broad classification into temperaments. If we are going to be reasonably accurate, we need to be more specific. Our man not only has a temperament but he also has a dominant trait which must be considered. I speak now of mental attitude. It is largely a matter of psychology—of mental habit. Here is a man of opinionated mentality. He is positive in his judgments. He is one of these "cock-sure" brothers. Now, obviously, his conclusions are reached by a very different process than that employed by the open-minded, judicial man. The latter is more ready to listen to reason. He weighs and considers. Then again, both of these men are different from the cautious-minded fellow—the one who draws away from you—whose mind naturally assumes the hesitant, critical attitude. He is the brother with the "Missouri" mentality. He needs to be shown. I take it that these three traits—the opinionated, the open-minded, the cautious—are distinct enough so that they can be identified in a casual contact. Furthermore, temperament does not determine it. Either trait may be dominant in either the phlegmatic or the sensitive temperament. I do not overlook the fact that there is often a curious mixture of mental traits in the same individual. It is also true that mood enters in here and often upsets our diagnosis. Nevertheless, I insist that in nearly every man, and in nearly every circumstance, you can distinguish his dominant trait.

Take the opinionated man for example. Often you need only step into his office and glance around. Perhaps an employee is speaking with him. The very attitude of the man is arbitrative, as if to say, "I am Sir Oracle, and when I open my lips let no dog bark." There are waves of cock-sureness in the atmosphere. To be sure the situation is seldom as obvious as this. More often it is not until after you start the conversation that this trait asserts itself. But it is quite sure to do so promptly. He will quickly assume an attitude of opposition and give voice to positive opinions and objections.

Now, the way to handle such a trait is with deference. One should defer to such a man, ask his opinions, and act as if his views were well worth while. I do not mean that one should be spineless or suppliant. One should not make of himself what Emerson called a "mush of concession." One can be deferential and still maintain his dignity and self-respect, but should avoid getting into a jam with such a man. There is no advantage in a deadlock.

Now in regard to the open-minded trait. I take it that this can be distinguished quite as easily. Such a man listens, asks questions, discusses, and offers his views in a considerate fashion. He seems willing to get at the facts. He does not attempt to foreclose the case in advance. This is the easiest kind of trait to handle. You may not get what you are after, but you will, at least, get your case in front of him. He should be met on his own ground, and in his own fashion—that is to say, with frankness and reason. There is no need to manœuver. One need only be easy, natural, conversational and courteous.

The cautious trait shows itself in an attitude of criticism, hesitation, doubt. This man has an inherent fondness for points of difficulty. His mental slant is toward the off-side. He is like the man whom Josh Billings described: "he knows a lot of things that ain't so," and most of them are things that stand in the way of favorable action. Such a trait should be handled with special demonstrations and proof. Objections and obstacles should be anticipated and removed in advance. If possible, this prospect should be led to figure the thing out for himself, handle the machine himself, or test the article, read the endorsement letters, or eat some of the food. He needs the visible, the tangible, the Q.E.D.

A word of caution right here is in point. I do not advocate an exclusive method of handling each temperament and trait. Each might be handled by a combination of these methods. It is more a matter of emphasis, than otherwise. Bearing this in mind, we might sum up the discussion by quoting from my book "Developing Sales Personality."

"Handle the phlegmatic temperament with deliberation; the sensitive with directness the opinionated trait with deference; the open-minded with frankness; the cautious with proof."[1] But understand that this is largely a matter of emphasis and also of personality. Every man should work out his own methods, but he would do well to experiment with those which I have presented here.

Turning now to a wider aspect of this question, I would like to call attention to some principles and methods which are equally effective with all temperaments and traits. I am not sure but that they constitute the most important phase of this whole subject. Every man is, to himself, the center of the whole universe. Everything comes to a focus in his individual consciousness. Therefore, the deepest of human instincts are those of self-importance and self-interest. The most vital subject to any man is himself, his family, his business, his reputation, his property. Some of us conceal this under a camouflage of altruism. But the fact remains that with each of us, the center of the whole system is, I, Me, and Mine. I do not mean to be cynical. I am not scoffing at human nature. I am fond of human nature. I do not know of anything so interesting as a man. I do not wholly agree with our great friend Mark Twain when he called men "the damned human race." I am fully aware of the capacities for honor, truth, nobility, and service that are wrapped up in the personality of every man. I quite agree with Emerson that when we chat with our neighbor over the backyard fence "Jove nods to Jove behind our conversations." In other words, there is something divine in every one of us. No, I am not cynical about my fellow man. I concede that Emerson had a great point there. But in my own scheme of things I also allow a liberal percentage for Mark Twain's estimate. In fact, I give Mark something of a margin over Emerson. I insist that our average man in spite of the divine spark within him is most vitally interested in his own self—his ego—his I, Me, and Mine. It follows that in making our personal adjustment to the other man we should assume him to be a person of dignity and importance, no matter what his social standing may be. This should be shown by a certain attitude of courtesy and consideration. The man will instinctively respond to it. This is not a matter of mere surface manners on our part. It goes deeper than that. We must develop in our mind a certain respect for the other man, just because he is a man. This is a very deep principle when you stop to think. It is an acid test of your philosophy of humanity—of human society. It is a mighty important question of every man to ask—"What is my real attitude toward men? Do I distrust them? Do I dislike them? Do they make me tired? Underneath my outward suavity, do I feel as if I would like to kick them, especially when they are jostling me in the subway?"

---

[1] See "Developing Sales Personality"—Prentice-Hall, N. Y.

Some one told Thomas Carlyle that Emerson declared that he accepted the universe. "Gad, he'd better," said Carlyle. So with you and me in our attitude toward men. Here we are—men—all around us. Life itself means personal relationships with men. If we wish to get on with them, we'd better accept them. The fine art of personal contacts requires that we accept them at their best. If our genuine inner attitude shows that, why—they will respond at once. But we must really mean it. It is easy to detect a counterfeit interest in another. We must get over on his side of the fence—approach him from the standpoint of his personal interests, and our approach must have the ring of genuineness. We should develop what is called the "you" attitude, and it must be the real thing. Men instinctively recognize that, and they are grateful for it. They get weary and tired of the "pull and haul," of greed and selfishness. Along comes a man whose genuine attitude is that of admiration and friendly interest. It is like the breath of a June morning. They open up to it. They call that kind of a man a good fellow—a good mixer—and so he is.

Now there is only one way to perfect this attitude and that is to practice it. Practice upon men the way you would practice upon a cornet if you were learning to play one. Mix constantly with all sorts and conditions of men and keep on mixing. That attitude of "otherism" may seem affected and unnatural at first—it may really be so—but if you will persist and do your best to mean it, you will gradually grow to mean it.

Good fellowship will become genuine and automatic. It will get to be your second nature. You will wake up some day to find yourself a regular good fellow. And you will have discovered the deepest secret of how to handle man.

By permission of the author.

“1918–1925”—A MEMORIAL DAY ADDRESS

ANDRÉ MORIZE

André Morize is professor of French literature in Harvard University, author of several books on the history of eighteenth century French literature, and a lecturer known from coast to coast. Before 1913, when he was called to the faculty of Johns Hopkins University, he had been a professor at the University of Bordeaux, France. In August, 1914, he joined the French infantry; served as sergeant, lieutenant, captain; was wounded in action and awarded the Croix de Guerre, with two citations. Harvard University called him first in May, 1917, but as professor of military science; and this he was until after the armistice. Professor Morize is a Chevalier of the Legion of Honor.

This Memorial Address was delivered on May 30, 1925, in Appleton Chapel at Harvard.

It is fitting that there should be, in the life of nations just as in the life of men, hours of reflection and meditation. We pause a moment, we interrupt the routine of work and days to consider, in the peace of an hour's thought, the way which has been traversed and the perspectives which open before us. When an entire nation takes upon itself this discipline of meditation, its significance becomes far more forceful and more profound. Now, in this country, more perhaps than in any other, there exists this practice and this noble custom: on several occasions throughout the year all hearts are united in a common movement of thanksgiving and commemoration; they draw together in the presence of the great glories, the lofty deeds, and the weighty sacrifices which have been the foundation of your national life. And here, today, are we gathered, just as thousands of others, in one of those beneficial hours of feeling and remembrance.

But there is also a personal recollection which I beg leave to evoke, because it weighs upon my mind so heavily today: seven years ago this morning, I was invited to deliver an address under the very same circumstances—the 30th of May, 1918. Seven years. . . . Doubtless very little in the infinity of human history, but seven years so filled with momentous happenings and changes that those days of 1918 seem to have receded to some mysterious and tragic past.

May, 1918. I remember. I was in uniform,—in the uniform of an army that people then liked to call an "allied army." There were hundreds of uniforms in the audience. There was that splendid Harvard youth, organized as a military body, and enthusiastic for the new duties which awaited them, and which they accepted with hearts of flame. There were many among them who were about to go and to die. There was joy, and anxiety, and tears. There were mothers who had already made their sacrifice, and many others who, hearts tortured yet willing, felt the threat and the glory of the impending sacrifice. The red star worn by so many was, in many cases, about to become a gold star. This great country, carried away by a wave of idealism never to be forgotten, grew greater still in the eyes of the world, and in its own eyes. There was everywhere—even more than the desire and the hope of a victory—the will and the certainty of that victory. And yet, yonder, on the ravaged soil of France, the hour was particularly grave and dark: Germany had broken our lines, and the bloody stain of invasion had spread wider. The enemy offensive was one of desperate energy, and the same desperate energy was in the resistance of our soldiers who had almost reached the limit of their moral and physical strength. Like messengers of hope, your troops were arriving; their intervention was decisive, and the whole world, holding its breath over the formidable struggle, awaited the issue of those fearful hours which would decide the fate of a cause we all knew to be just and beautiful. There was everywhere, in all the countries that were fighting for this cause, an admirable, a marvelous unanimity. All the words that expressed then the deep forces at work in the battle, the ideal of honor, of liberty, of human civilization for which so many men were giving their lives, all these words were, at the time, full of meaning and reality. When publicly uttered, they did not sound like oratorical commonplaces. Indeed, it was not the hysteria of a people artificially galvanized by I-know-not-what astute and shrewd propaganda; it was the spirit, the faith, the will of a noble and powerful nation, sure of what it was doing, happy to do it, determined to achieve its purpose. America, during those months, gave to history one of the most magnificent examples that men have ever known. She has added to the titles of nobility of the human race. And there is not one man, not one woman, in this country, who has not been enriched, morally and spiritually, for having experienced those hours.

And that same unanimity was among the nations. Our military leaders had organized the unity of command; five great nations had accepted and realized the unity of obedience, discipline, will, and ideal. The very name of France, of Belgium, used to carry away with emotion American throngs, and France and Belgium, grateful for so much good already accomplished, welcomed America as the decisive factor of liberation and salvation.

Seven years ago, it was in such an atmosphere that we celebrated Memorial Day. It was with hearts full of these lofty, spiritual forces, our eyes dazzled by these superhuman visions, and our energy intent upon that common goal, that we knelt at the graves of our dead to lay there our tribute, and heed their message. And there was as much fervor, sincerity, and loyalty in our tribute, as in our desire to receive from them inspiration and guidance.

Seven years. Memorial Day. The ranks of the dead of May, 1918, have been increased by hundreds of thousands of other dead, cruel and sublime price of the victory that the first dead had ordered us to achieve. And we are here again, we, the living, with palms and flowers in our hands, with hearts still torn with anxiety—with more anxiety indeed, for when we listen to the message that comes up again from these graves which we are decorating, I do not know whether we are ready, as we were on Memorial Day, 1918, to receive it, and to understand.

Seven years. Memorial Day. There is something tragic that still weighs upon us, but it is not the same kind of anxiety we felt seven years ago. Today it is a question, hundreds of questions that come to our lips, questions that are unpleasant, perhaps, but unavoidable, and which we must have the courage to face. Those beautiful hours, what is left of them? That ideal, what have we done with it? Those ideas, those great words for which we saw these young men die, what was their value? Were they realities or illusions? Moral and spiritual treasures, or empty dreams and mere lies? And when we come again with our flowers, our uniforms, our music, our speeches, and perhaps our tears, to celebrate our dead, our great dead, our beloved dead, are we sure that we still do it as a deep testimony of our faith, admiration, and unanimous sympathy? Do we do it for them, or for ourselves, to salute them as the heroes of a cause which is still ours, or just to give ourselves an occasion to affirm and advertise our own virtues, our patriotism and loyalty, and to contemplate and admire ourselves by the light of the funeral torches which we burn on their graves? In short, are we sure that our tribute to the dead is as acceptable to them today as it was during those solemn hours of May, 1918?

Now that same question may be put in other words: is that attitude of many of us, as manifested on a day like this, altogether logical and consistent with various utterances heard on other occasions?

During the days of darkness, we bowed down our heads before our dead. We brought wreaths, delivered eulogies, dedicated memorials. Why? It was not only a national mourning, not only the sorrow we felt as relatives or friends; it was not only a tribute to our dead. It was a symbol also: symbol of our adherence to the ideas which they represented, of our sympathy for the sacrifice which they made and which we were eager to make when it should be asked of us symbol of our loyalty to an ideal that had been theirs; symbol of a cause unstained by selfishness or narrow national ambition, in which we felt that justice was on our side; symbol of a common faith that then was ours.

That faith, do we still have it? That ideal, do we still believe in it? That symbol of the sacrifice of our dead—is it one more dead thing among so many dead things, or a living, enduring, eternal reality?

For one of two things: either we still believe in it, faithful to our dead and their virtues, or, if we do not, all our gestures of today, our words, our prayers, and our tears are nothing but derision, irony, and criminal hypocrisy. Either they died for something worth while—and then they have a right to have the nation come to their graves and pray,—or they were dupes of a dangerous and inhuman illusion; they were poor dreamers, foolishly giving up all their best reasons of living for ideas that it is our duty to combat today, and then they have a right only to our pity, our compassion, even our indulgence for their mistake.

Either those sons of Harvard, volunteers of 1914–15–16, who spontaneously went to answer the call of their conscience, were the knights of a true cause, believing that there are just wars, unavoidable and necessary wars, and that the life of the one who refuses them is less noble than that of the one who accepts them,—or they were nothing but poor and restless lads, intoxicated by the spirit of adventure, like those who risk their lives in a dangerous sport for the love of hazard and success; and then, let us not talk any more about them. Let us just say that they have been courageous but without a reasonable purpose, heroic but not admirable; and instead of gathering together to think of them and find from them inspiration, let us devote all our strength to counteract such dangerous example, and let us teach our children not to imitate them.

That is what I feel so deeply, so strongly today. No, we have no right. We have no right here, this morning, to glorify our war dead, and, tomorrow, to go and proclaim that there is no moral value or spiritual grandeur in the sacrifice of the one who dies, arms in hands, for a cause that the conscience of a nation accepts and adopts. We have no right to speak here of soldiers of liberty, of justice, of patriotism, and tomorrow to go along the streets, bleating that any war is a crime, whatever its motive may be. We have no right to honor here the dead of your great armies, and tomorrow to treat the very army of your country as a survival of barbarism in a civilized land. We have no right to gather here, in a place of prayer and worship in order to come closer to those men who have carried arms, have used them, and have perished by the sword after striking with the sword,—tomorrow to gather in other places of prayer and worship (and with voices often trembling more from fear than from indignation) to condemn those who want,—perhaps to save our country,—to see it strong, well armed, and well protected. We have no right to celebrate, today, Memorial Day, and tomorrow to object to Defense Day, symbol of the will of a nation to sacrifice itself, the day when, this same nation being threatened, the sacrifice would be necessary.

Either we believe in patriotism, or we do not believe in it. If we see in patriotism a sort of survival from barbaric ages, one of these obsolete ideas which, after so many others, must give way before the strength of new lights; if patriotism means a heritage of national hatred which we must forget or turn into a vague sentimentalism of human brotherhood; if, in behalf of the illusive joy of calling ourselves citizens of the world and brothers to all men, we are willing to give up our title of Americans, of French, of Belgians, of Italians, rather than to rise, in case of danger, for defense or protection; if we believe that a country is, after all, nothing but a geographic expression, provisional and artificial; if we allow ourselves to be hypnotized by the idea that war, even to save that illusion, "the land of our fathers," is such a crime that it would be better not to resist, but to yield and to accept; if we do not believe in patriotism, let us at least have the frankness to leave our dead alone, and to wait for grass and oblivion to cover their graves, until all trace of them has disappeared.

But if we believe in patriotism, and do not consider it as a mere philosophical idea, simply for theoretical discussions, or as a historical fact, henceforth antiquated; if "our country," yours or mine, to us is a living flesh, and a beloved personality; if it is that soil so much labor, love, and blood have given us, that air that, for us, is permeated with such subtle qualities, and those thousand recollections, common glories, and common trials, that build up the very soul of a nation;—if all our being revolts at the very thought that some day all these things could be snatched from us, refused to us, taken away by others, defiled and destroyed;—if we still have that childish courage to believe that a flag, if it is ours, is a symbol that justifies all the sacrifices, and if, on such days of national thanksgiving and commemoration we cannot look at it without a deep thrill in our hearts, and even in our flesh;—if we believe in this, then let us turn towards our dead, draw closer to them. Let us not hesitate to proclaim that if the day comes, we will accept our duty as they did; and in a spirit of pride and humility, let us receive their message.

Oh, great dead of this great country, dead who, in the days of revolt and rebellion, arms in your hands, gave your blood that the sons of this soil might have liberty and independence; dead of the Civil War, brothers of these others, who still living, tell us your beautiful story, you who, arms in your hands, have given your blood that this nation might be the land of unity, of humanity, and of justice;—and you dead of the Great War, millions of dead, who have given yourselves with one soul to the same idea; dead of Harvard, whose names are offered every day as the words of a prayer and a hymn to the young men who have taken your place; dead of my own country; Unknown Soldiers, who, in Washington, or in Paris, in Brussels or in London, in Warsaw or in Rome, sleep by a flame that must never go out—we shall never listen to the counsels of cowardice, and the words of fear, nor to the whining and snivelling sentimentalism which so often disguises fear and cowardice. We shall love peace, for you, our heroes, died for peace only. We, living, shall work for peace as you have sacrificed yourselves that peace might come. We shall do everything to prevent such catastrophes as the one in which you found your glory and your death, but we shall accept only such a peace as that in which you could come back, live again, and look us straight in the face, with a look that our eyes could stand.

We want to remember. We want to remember everything: not only our heroes, not only names, and tables, and dates, and legends, but the very things they have seen, and the suffering they have endured. Not that we desire to make hatred a religion, or a duty: we shall keep the hope that some day there will be, in the hearts of all men, enough strength and virtue and love, and in all the countries of the world enough security, so that the very word war might disappear from every human language. But, while waiting for that beautiful dawn, and especially after the horrible night we have had to go through, we still are a few who do not want to forget. We want to believe in love, in forgiveness, and in peace, and all the blessings that come with it, but we still believe in justice, as we did ten years ago; and when we think of our dead, we think of all the reasons they had to accept their sacrifice. The manly and courageous words of Maeterlinck come back to my memory: "I tried to lift myself above the fray; but, the higher I rose, the more I saw of the madness and the horror of it, of the justice of one cause and the injustice of the other. It is possible that one day, when time has wearied remembrance and restored the ruins, wise men will tell us that we were mistaken and that our standpoint was not lofty enough; that everything can be forgotten, explained, understood; but they will say it because they will no longer know what we know, nor will they have seen what we have seen."

I shall not add a word: we think of our dead, today, who have "known and seen." Let us realize upon what visions of horror and crime they gazed, when they last closed their eyes. Let us remember that they have carried away with them the intimate knowledge of these tragic things which our hearts, too often timid and pusillanimous, like to dismiss as an intolerable nightmare. Our dead must teach us to remember.

At the same time, they throw, for us, a strong light on the idea of heroism. I am aware that it is not the fashion, today, to say much about military heroism. Some minds, very sure of themselves—surer, perhaps, of their rhetorical ability than of their aptitude to face physical danger—some tender souls, as well, often look upon deeds of military bravery with compassion mixed with horror. These dead are, to them, more the involuntary victims of a catastrophe than the heroes who freely chose their lot. Now, this is precisely what constitutes the beneficial and splendid inspiration which, from so many graves, comes to our hearts today. We were living in a civilization of refinement, delicate pleasures, and material happiness. We were working at the arts of peace. Education was forming our minds, and athletic life was developing our bodies. We knew the price and charm of happiness in work, of the sane, normal virtues of every day, of the peaceful spirit of brotherly co-operation between men. It seemed that our life was to become more and more easy, pleasant, and beautiful. Now, was there not something absurd, retrograde, almost barbaric, in accepting cheerfully the sacrifice of all these things? Was it possible that there were men ready to leave everything, to forget everything—including themselves—to face death, and to die, simply in behalf of an idea, of an intangible ideal, of a word which unexpectedly came and stirred the human conscience? Yes, it was possible; they told us that for them something existed more precious than riches, comfort, happiness, health, peace, and life itself. For this was just the choice these young men by the thousands made, and the high truth they proclaimed for us.

For they made a choice. Never, never say that they had no choice—that they had to go and die, when others, well sheltered behind them, ordered them to go and die. Never say that they have been heroes only because they could not do otherwise. They had their choice, every minute. To save their lives, to return and find again all the happiness they had abandoned, it was enough to yield, to surrender, to give up, to decide that they wanted to save their lives. It was enough to accept shame and defeat and cowardice. It was enough to make a choice—and to choose precisely what they have not chosen. Now it is one of the great benefits of those dark hours to have proved and revealed that our world of today was still able—more able than ever—to rise to that sublime idea of heroism. "If it be true that humanity is worth just as much as the sum total of latent heroism which it contains, then we may declare that humanity was never stronger nor more exemplary than during those days, when our dead chose the road that led them where they are." (Maeterlinck.)

But where they are, we know today. We feel it more strongly than ever. They are among us, around us, in us. Death for one's country is not like so many other deaths, which leave nothing in the bruised hearts of men but emptiness and memory: on the contrary, it is fecund and creative. That heroism is scattered abroad, all around us, among so many other forces which our science knows how to conquer and to utilize. It is ours to receive and interpret the priceless message that comes from it. Today, as seven years ago, the treasure is there, provided we are willing to draw upon it.

Many souls cherish the idea that from war nothing can come forth but evil. This evil we do not deny; it is beyond measure, and the whole earth is still crying and trembling. But there were so many moral and spiritual riches engendered and developed by the War that we should not be blind to them. Thousands who have been through the war, the last one or another, know this. They believe in it, and they say so. Those who went through the War want to have the right to speak too, and they feel, sometimes, that all the wavers of peace banners must resign themselves, occasionally, to be gauged and discussed in the light of some of the ideas with which veterans of all wars have enriched their experience and their conscience. Love for our country, the security of our country, the life of our country, creates duties, sufferings, sacrifices, tears, heroism. We accept it all. We want to keep awake and watch. We want to listen to the voices from the graves. They speak words to us which no living tongue could utter. Spirit of war? No. Spirit of peace which we do not conceive except within the idea of patriotism. Spirit of patriotism, which we do not separate from all the things embodied in the sacrifice of those who died among the horrors of war that we might enjoy the blessings of our country.

One of the young dead of the last War wrote, in a letter to his mother, that "the War was the most tender human experience he had ever known." The most tender: . . . it was because he had been able to see, beyond the sufferings and the merciless necessities of the fighting, beyond hatred and horror, the splendid blossoming of love, of which our dead are a symbol. The most tender: . . . it was because he realized that those hours which brought so much mourning to our hearts were also those when men have loved more deeply than ever, loved an ideal, loved a country, and loved other men.

Many men, and many women, do not understand this: there is no harm in that. It does not matter. A flame shines on the grave of the Unknown Soldier: just a few hands are enough to keep it bright. The only necessary thing is that the flame should not go out, so that if the night becomes too dark around us, those who are turning their backs to the flame today, may discover its light again, like a beacon, to show them the way.

You know of what unspeakable horrors the name of Douaumont is for us a symbol. Nowhere more than in that corner of the battlefield of Verdun had the War been more merciless, more bloody, more terrible. Everything one may detest in war was there in the abominable desolation of a torn land where, by the hundreds of thousands, allies and enemies sleep their martyrs' sleep.

But near the ruins of the fort, a spring which the battle had defiled, buried, and dried up, has now come to life again. From the depths of the earth, it has found its way towards the light of the sky, and its water is so clear, so fresh, so pure, that the tired and weary pilgrim of the battlefield may stop and drink of it. And so we all feel today—day of the dead, and day of the living—that it is near that spring we must kneel down, to draw from it, among tragic and cruel memories, beautiful and pure reasons to live and love.

By permission of the author.

ACCOUNTANCY AS A PROFESSION

EDMUND E. DAY

Edmund E. Day, former dean of the School of Business Administration at the University of Michigan (1924–'27), is a noted economist and statistician. He is a native of New Hampshire, a graduate of Dartmouth and a PH.D. of Harvard, and was a member of both faculties. During the war he did important Government work as a statistician.

The address quoted here was delivered at the annual meeting of the American Society of Certified Public Accountants, at Detroit, Michigan, September, 1924.

MR. PRESIDENT AND MEMBERS: One might think from the very generous introduction of your Chairman that I was an old hand in the field of business education. As a matter of fact, I am officially a novice. I have been specifically engaged in business education only since July 1, 1924, when the new school at Michigan was formally established. But I have watched the development of business education with interest for a number of years; ever since, in fact, as an undergraduate in Dartmouth College I followed the development of the Amos Tuck School of Administration and Finance, the first of the schools of business to require a substantial amount of college work for admission. More recently I have been in direct touch with the work of the Graduate School of Business Administration at Harvard and have had opportunity to observe at close range the splendid progress made by that school in the development of truly professional instruction in this new field.

Despite this sustained interest in business education—a subject with which the members of this association must inevitably be concerned—I should hesitate to come before you on this subject were it not for two facts. In the first place, I was invited to come by Mr. Springer, of your Association. Mr. Springer is auditor of the University of Michigan; and any invitation from him I regard as a summons. In the second place, since I am now officially in charge of a School of Business Administration, I am anxious to get ideas on the subject of business education. It has been my experience that the easiest way to acquire ideas is to try to express some. The discussion which is sometimes thus provoked, while hard on the ideas originally expressed, serves to pound out the truth. In the fire of argument somebody brings out a gun and shoots a shell straight through the target.

"Accountancy as a Profession" is the subject on which, I believe, I am to speak. It is a large order for the brief time which I shall take. Law and medicine, not to mention one or two other vocations of ancient lineage, have long enjoyed professional status. In this elevated position they have acquired a degree of prestige which appears to have become the object of envy of other occupations. In consequence, we are acquiring a whole crop of new self-announced professions. Hardly a week goes by but some communication passes over my desk in which another line of business is referred to as a profession—real estate, building management, advertising, merchandising, and so on. The list is becoming formidable. Apparently, as soon as any vocation becomes self-conscious, it has aspirations; and just as soon as it has aspirations, it yearns for professional recognition.

Now, it is easy enough to say, "We are a profession." The accountants have been saying that for some time. I wonder how carefully they have considered the question—what constitutes professional status. In just what terms are we to define eligibility to the honorable company of recognized professions—the law, medicine, theology.

What I propose to do is to consider this very question. I shall endeavor to indicate the bases of professional status, the elements which every vocation must at least consider seriously if it aspires to recognition as a profession. On some of these points I expect to obtain your assent; others you will probably think at least debatable. In the interest of "Safety First," I shall proceed by first submitting those upon which I expect most ready agreement, then advancing to some of the matters which I suspect you may regard as questionable—possibly quite visionary.

In the first place I take it that any vocation, to be professional in character, must require a high degree of technical skill or competence. If the correspondence schools could turn out an accountant in the course of six months, I should seriously question the professional character of accountancy. It is because the schools cannot accomplish this result that the claim of professional standing in accountancy is to be seriously regarded. In this company, it is quite unnecessary to urge the necessity of solid requirements for admission to practice. The certified public accountants are constantly raising the standards of technical proficiency. In the judgment of most outsiders, these standards are certain to be sufficiently high. There seems to be then, in this group at least, insistence upon all the technical requirements any one could reasonably expect.

For just the more formal foundational training, a course of two or three years of intensive study is none too long for the technical ground work of present practice in accountancy. Even more may be necessary. If this is so, accountancy takes a place alongside of law and theology. In the matter of minimum technical requirements, accountancy would appear to measure up to the standards of at least some of the recognized professions.

Of course, further work is necessary in the definition of requisite technical proficiency for professional accountancy. It is of the utmost importance that the required technical information shall become more and more a body of generally acknowledged and accepted principles. This, I assume, is one of the most important tasks of such a nation-wide association as your own. This association, as well as others covering closely related fields, needs to grapple with the problem of standardizing accounting concepts and accounting practice. The task is a difficult one. It is not always easy to harmonize general principles and specific practices.

For example, the difference between repairs and replacements is not always readily drawn. The story is told that a cooper who had been making barrels for a number of years in an Eastern town, finding trade somewhat dull, moved out to a bustling Western community. Here he found a very large part of his business consisted of making over barrels that had already seen good service. He was a skillful artisan and did not demur as long as there was something on which to work. Given a fair chance he went to work and made a repair job look like a good replacement. If he had brought to him a few staves and a hoop, he managed to work out a barrel. The story goes, however, that one day somebody imposed on the man's good nature by bringing around nothing but a bung. At this he closed up his shop and took to farming, where the distinction between repairs and replacement is not so troublesome.

Now, there are a great many unsettled technical problems in accountancy which undoubtedly you know much more about than I. These technical problems call for solution as one comes to define the minimum requirement for professional recognition in this line of business. Certainly a real profession has technical standards by which current practice is to be judged.

Another requisite of professional status would seem to be a secondary line of more general knowledge. Here, possibly, I tread upon more debatable ground. It seems clear to me, however, that no man is a first class member of the legal profession who does not know the function of law, who does not know what law is designed to accomplish, what its place is in the maintenance of orderly society. The lawyer should know, for example, the rational limits of law and order in modern society. He should have clear conceptions of the evolution of the institutions with which he has to deal—the difficult forms of trial, the courts, legal procedure, etc. In other words, no lawyer does justice to his profession unless he can orient his vocation in the life of the community in which it has to be practiced.

This, unless I am mistaken, is a second essential feature of professional status. As long as practitioners are pure technicians, operating simply on the material which is put in their hands in a purely technical fashion, they are not measuring up to professional standards. I believe the time will come when the accountant must know something about business in general, about political administration and public policy. If he is specializing in tax work, he should know what taxes are designed to do. He should have conceptions of justice in taxation. He should be able to distinguish between a merely technical enforcement of law and a fair adjustment of conflicting interests in a tax dispute. He should acquire certain notions of ulterior effects and a capacity for farsighted judgments in the technical application of accounting principles.

This clearly enlarges substantially the contract of professional accountancy. It means that the accountant must know something about government, economic science, finance, business administration, and other subjects which lie beyond accounting, but in some measure constitute the foundation on which accountancy is erected. There is a reason why the best law schools require a college training for admission. One might say that general collegiate education has nothing to do with law; that a man can practice law satisfactorily whether or not he knows anything about ordinary academic pursuits. But there is an increasing disposition to urge more and more strongly in legal circles the desirability of a broad general foundation for the specific professional studies. The time will come, if accountancy seriously contends for professional recognition, when something of the same underlying training will be expected of accountants. This does not mean, of course, that all accountants will have such training; behind the leaders of any profession are a host of mere followers. But among the leaders in the profession of accounting will be men who understand the fundamentals of the social system in which accounting functions.

A third requisite of profession status would seem to be a kind of self-consciousness which leads the members of the profession to formulate rules of good conduct. Two developments are likely to appear together in this connection. First, men working along the same line evolve common interests and come together physically in conventions and association meetings of one.

These then are, in general, the four points upon which it seems to me any pretense of professional standing must rest: (1) a substantial body of systematic technical knowledge constituting a minimum requirement for admission to practice; (2) training in the underlying subjects which place the profession in the life of the community which the profession is designed to serve; (3) some definite code of good practice which is generally recognized and successfully enforced; and (4) clear recognition of obligations to the community and the development of means by which these obligations are to be effectively fulfilled.

Possibly some of you have already decided that all this is quite visionary; doubtless some have set it down as obviously academic. Let me say frankly that I realize fully that what I have been saying constitutes something in the nature of counsel of perfection. I am reminded, however, of an incident which happened in the class-room of one of our public schools. The instructor of mathematics was trying to demonstrate to a rather stupid boy the concept of a limit which could be successfully approached, but never reached. He was having a good deal of difficulty in making this concept at all clear. The idea of approaching the object but never reaching it was apparently beyond the boy's grasp. Finally, the teacher decided to resort to a concrete illustration, the universal refuge of all teachers when in serious difficulty in instruction. "Suppose," said he, "that to-night you go around to see your young lady and find her waiting for you in the parlor on the sofa. When you come in the door you say, 'Hello, Mary,' and go half way to her, then pause a moment and go another half way, then another half way, and so on, will you ever get to her?"

The boy scratched his head a minute and then said, "Well, I think I'd get near enough for all practical purposes."

This is about my feeling with regard to the requisites of professional status for accountancy. It is a limit I have been talking about. It may prove to be a long way off, but time is long, and by repeatedly covering half the distance to the goal you are fairly certain to get, in time, close enough for all practical purposes.

I thank you!

From *The Certified Public Accountant.*

ADDRESS BEFORE THE CITIZENS' COMMITTEE, UNIVERSITY OF PITTSBURGH

INTRODUCING GEORGE WHARTON PEPPER

HOMER D. WILLIAMS

Homer D. Williams has been president of the State Normal College at Bowling Green, Ohio, since 1913, and is well known as an institute lecturer. He was born in 1865, educated chiefly at Ohio Northern and Columbia universities, and, beginning as a rural teacher, was soon a superintendent of schools.

GENTLEMEN: We are gathered here tonight to see some facts as they are between ourselves and the University of Pittsburgh. That institution is the oldest university west of the Allegheny Mountains. It was started when Pittsburgh was a log-cabin village. It was started in order that the youths of the village might have more generous imagination, more freedom from prejudice, more capacity of discrimination, and more faith. And now in these muddled days these things are still rare. The need of them is Pittsburgh's greatest need; and, as I have talked with some of you here recently, it has seemed to me that we might consider it a privilege to get together and to bring our clearest thinking to the problem. In this connection I am delighted this evening that Senator George Wharton Pepper is with us. The subject is one which he understands exceedingly well.

We people of Pittsburgh are proud of Pittsburgh. We want the city to go forward, always to go forward in industry and wealth, happiness, and fullness of life. Headway of this kind does not just happen; it requires that we give ourselves to the task. The task is big. It means that we must create here a university which will do for us what Oxford and Cambridge have done for England or what Harvard has done for Boston.

It behooves us, then, to interest ourselves in the University of Pittsburgh, to aid its progress, to place it in its rightful position among ourselves. The raw material for the University is here. Young men and women stand at the doors asking for a college education, which will enable them to succeed and to be happy in the succeeding. Of the students attending the University, about seventy per cent come from Allegheny County; eighty per cent come from Western Pennsylvania; and over ninety percent come from within the state.

How are we to begin? Well, the plant of the University is inadequate. Its facilities do not nearly meet the demands made upon it. The University is a corporation limping along without the necessary equipment and buildings to accomplish its great purposes. The task, as I said, is large, but it is worth while, and the effort ought to be commensurate with the size of the job. If we put the same energy into this work that the manufacturers of the city put into their own businesses, we shall succeed. To do this is not charity; it is good business, it is the highest sort of loyalty to Pittsburgh, it is a splendid privilege.

Senator Pepper, as I said, is with us this evening. In these days we think of him as belonging to Pittsburgh quite as much as to Philadelphia. Senator Pepper is a graduate of the University of Pennsylvania and for seventeen years was a professor of law at that University. There is no one who has greater knowledge than he of what a university may mean in the whole welfare of a community. It gives me pleasure to introduce Senator George Wharton Pepper.

(*Note: Senator Pepper's speech begins on the next page.*)

THE GREATEST ENTERPRISE OF PITTSBURGH

GEORGE WHARTON PEPPER

George Wharton Pepper, lawyer and statesman, was born in Philadelphia in 1867. He is a scholar of large achievement and holds an LL.D. from his Alma Mater, the University of Pennsylvania, and from Yale. Mr. Pepper's name has appeared as a member of Philadelphia law firms, as Professor of Law at the University of Pennsylvania, and later one of its trustees, as lecturer at Yale, and as author of several digests and other volumes on legal practice and decisions. In 1922, on the death of Senator Penrose, he was appointed United States Senator for the term 1921–'27.

Mr. Williams and Gentlemen: It is a great pleasure to me to be here. I felt that I had three reasons for accepting Chancellor Bowman's invitation. First, I admire and trust him and, if he asks me to do anything, there is a very strong presumption in favor of an affirmative response. Second, I have what I esteem the very great honor of being by adoption an alumnus of the University of Pittsburgh, and its interests are therefore my interests. And, third, as a Senator from Pennsylvania, I cannot be indifferent to the welfare of any institution which is ministering to the higher life of the community in which it works, tending to make the citizenship of Pennsylvania wholesomer and more meet for the republic.

Now, this habit of Philadelphians coming to Pittsburgh and finding much to admire here was a habit that was formed long ago. A fellow townsman of mine, Judge Hugh Henry Brackenridge, of the class of 1777 of Princeton, rode over the mountains on horseback in 1781, and liked the Pittsburgh of that day so well that he cast in his lot with you. He remained here. Then he told us by letters about Pittsburgh. The city of that date, he wrote, consisted of a hundred houses; and the population he estimated at 1500, which sets one to thinking about the size of families. Fifteen to the household! I couldn't help thinking that a good many children were tumbling in and out of the houses when he counted them, and that perhaps he counted most of them several times. Or there may be some truth in his own observation on this subject. "This new country is highly prolific," the Judge said; and then he explained that there was a certain aromatic quality in the air in Pittsburgh which is favorable to the propagation of the species, and he added that, as the population was mostly made up of Scots and Irishmen, he was able to predict for the city a noble future.

That prophecy has been richly fulfilled. This is in many respects the most interesting and most notable community in America. I don't know of any place that I go, from one end of the country to the other, that so impresses me with its latent powers as Pittsburgh does. But I go to a good many places where people turn a larger percentage of their energies to community purposes. When I go to Cleveland, for instance, I feel that that city is splendidly at work as a community for its own highest aims. It wastes very little in the process of functioning. The whole community gets behind public movements; it puts an enormous energy into making its possibilities come true.

I go to other places and hear talk about what is being done. Here and there I see results. But I seldom hear talk in Pittsburgh about community projects. Time and again I have thought of this, and I have become aware that an enormous latent power exists here. I sometimes think to myself that Pittsburgh is still a city in the making; that you are in that interesting stage of development when you have not yet begun to realize your possibilities. The thing that impresses me is that, with all your great resources, there is still in you much of the old spirit of the frontier. I hope that that spirit will never pass away. Here is the spirit of the frontiersman who is desperately concerned that he should not be a meddler in other people's business and that nobody should meddle in his. Here is the spirit in which men, still as frontiersmen, desire to be left alone, believing that people are best governed when they are least governed. Here is a certain splendid individualism, a sense of isolation, romance, courage, and driving force, all of which make for the building of strong, rugged character. This heritage is yours, but it is one which in the process of time has to be modified by cooperative effort, lest the community continue to be a community of unrealized possibilities.

I wonder whether there is here much absorption on the part of all leading men in Pittsburgh in any one great community interest. I don't know enough to answer confidently, but I have suspected that there is not. I have observed that you form yourselves into groups in pursuit of great special interests. You have an enormous power focusing upon special commercial and industrial activities; you put forth enormous driving force, great intelligence, and high power. Group activity is the thing with which you are familiar. But I have sometimes wondered whether there is any one project of such tremendous magnitude that you are all able to lose yourselves in it and make it the expression of your zeal for the good of Pittsburgh.

I suspect that organized effort for the purpose of training the young for life is the greatest concern of mankind. Most of us around this table have reached an age when we will subscribe to that proposition. Children and grandchildren, somehow or other, seem to us now to have importance far greater than they had a few years ago. It is not that our powers are waning, so far as we can tell; it is rather that we get a new sense of relationships as we go on. I fancy that when we stop to think about it, most of us will agree that organized effort to train the young to think for themselves, to know the value of work, and to grow spiritually is the greatest concern that can enlist and engross us. I ask myself, in thinking of the University of Pittsburgh, what would it mean to this community if there should be something like a consensus that here is an instrumentality ready at hand which can be used for the greatest of all enterprises, training the young of the community for a larger life. You cannot think of the University rightly as an end in itself. No, the end is a better Pittsburgh, always a better Pittsburgh, greater in wealth, in diversity and sweep of energy, in industry, in capacity of life and spirituality. It is the great project in which you may most wisely lose yourselves.

We take the public school system as a matter of course. But education is a journey which begins with the dawn of life, a progress which terminates only with the grave. And the primary and secondary schools are concerned only with the earlier stages of the journey. The most interesting part of travel is to travel with your children when they are of an age to be your companions. Just think what it means to a man to enlarge the circle of his family of children by assuming some definite relationship or responsibility for the welfare of an organized group of the young people of the community and to devote himself consciously to the job of giving them a larger, wider, finer opportunity for a nobler life.

Here is the University of Pittsburgh. It is as old as the Constitution. It was founded in 1787, the year of the Constitutional Convention. That is a splendid heritage. It goes back far into the past, and the thing has grown until today it has over eight thousand students, of whom the great percentage come from Pittsburgh and vicinity. It is a great Pennsylvania institution, and it exists to give a larger life to the young people of the community.

Elementary and secondary education are essential. We accept that proposition as self-evident. But higher education is in no such position with us. It is apt to be submerged by vocation and oppressed by the material considerations of life. Too often education stops with the secondary schools, and life stays drab. This happens unless the cause of education is kept constantly before us to the end of the journey; unless there are institutions of higher learning to keep before the community that stage of the journey of education which is full of joy, that stage which is beyond the blackboard days of reading, writing and arithmetic, and the drudgery of it all, that stage above the timber-line of the mountain where you begin to see vistas of valley and hill and distant ocean. Unless there are institutions that can keep these reaches of education within the vision of the community, education becomes a poor thing. It becomes a mere handmaid of the material. It does not unlock the spiritual and intellectual possibilities of the race at all.

That has been wonderfully understood in the Old World. I remember how greatly interested I was years ago when I first read Pollock and Maitland's *History of English Law.* I became aware of the fact that the two oldest corporations of England are the universities of Oxford and Cambridge. And there are many cities in the Old World that we think of first because they are simply the shell that holds the kernel of intellectual life embodied in a great university. Take Heidelberg—there are the ruins of a castle, but the thing that lives is the University. The most distinctive thing about Paris still is not the Café Moulin Rouge, or the Boulevards, but the Universities. And so it is with Bologna and Pisa, and so on, wherever you go. The Old World has had the experience of a great community. The community has to live to fructify; it has to lead on to a larger and finer life; it must be the seat of an institution which opens to the eyes and mind all those reaches of the educational journey that are far beyond mere drudgery.

I like to think of culture as being the joy of the journey. You can take journeys that are devoid of joy; they are simply a means of overcoming space obstacles. But travel, in the proper sense, is a thing that opens the mind. The joy that comes from traveling through life with the mind open and the eyes wide makes men. You cannot have communities without men who have open eyes and open minds, and you cannot have institutions of the sort I have in mind except by co-operative effort. A university must, in a sense, be the community mobilized for the higher life, and you cannot ever reach your possible height in community development until all the powers in the community are enlisted for such mobilization.

You know how it is on the material side. Even the smallest town in America thinks it is incomplete unless it has a board of trade or a chamber of commerce. Those are profit-making organizations. They deal with trade and commerce. They mobilize the resources of the community in thought and power and interest in pursuit of the specific activity that they are organized to promote. Why not have a board of higher education? Why not have a chamber of culture? That is what a university is. It occupies the same relation to the life of the community on its higher side as the board of trade and the chamber of commerce do toward the commercial and material life of the community. A university is a chamber of culture, and I apprehend that men like you and me can do no better thing than to support a university which, like mercy, is a thing twice blessed—it blesses him that gives and him that takes. It is a blessing to the young people to provide for them the opportunities of the larger and wider life, but it is even more a blessing to us, because it gives us, in our maturity, as the shadows lengthen, some means of partaking in the life of the young.

I realize that in the old days there were excellencies in education which have passed away perhaps forever. My mother used to interest me greatly by giving me accounts of the training of a lawyer in Philadelphia as she knew it when she was a girl. My grandfather, Mr. George M. Wharton, was a well-known lawyer in Philadelphia. He had a beautiful home there on one of the old thoroughfares. In those days the office of the lawyer was in the house. My grandfather had his offices on the ground floor. And in those days, because court was over at three o'clock, the family dined at three. My grandfather would then go back into his office for the remainder of the afternoon and early evening. There were a score of young lawyers apprenticed to him. They studied law in his office. When nine o'clock in the evening came, it was customary, mother said, for my grandfather to come up to the drawing-room, bringing the students with him. She and her sisters were there, with cake and wine for the young men. There they sat together, and the day ended in that kind of social intercourse. That gave a flavor to the bar which is so absolutely different from what we know now that we cannot help regretting that the day has passed.

But it has passed. By the time I came to the bar we were still registered in offices, but the life and the growth of things had made it impossible for the nominal preceptor to figure much in the life of those who were nominally his students. And the law school has grown up to supply the lack. Group education has taken the place of individual education, and we may say that there has been a loss. Perhaps so, but let us be constructive about the situation.

The thing to do is to take group education and begin a process of development within the group, which will bring back, as far as may be, the excellencies of the training of the older day. And when you take a great group of eight thousand students in a university community, in each of the different households which together make up the university community, there is a possibility of developing a wholesome educational contact which means the joy of the journey for all those young people. A law school can be made a place just as close to life, just as much shot through with influences of the right sort, as the office of the old bar. But it does not happen accidentally. The great spirit, the real teacher, must be there giving himself to his students. The students react and shortly are on the way toward realizations of the most worth-while purposes and ideals of which they are individually capable.

After all, very much of what we learn shines through into our lives from the lives of others. When a great teacher possesses intelligence and high motives, and when we come under his spell, we find ourselves later giving out to our fellows as he gave out to us. That is a great lesson to learn.

Let me say that I have never worked with a man or come in contact with any one who seems to me to bring to his work so large a percentage of his intellectual power or so clear a motive for the use of that power as does my colleague, Senator Reed (University of Pittsburgh School of Law '03). The man gives his life away in his work. In this he is unique among the men I know. He seems to me to be the ideal product of an educational system. Among his friends here he seems to be just the right illustration to make clear my idea about the University.

Let me here throw in a suggestion. It seems to me to be wise that men of power, men with strong ideas as to how life ought to be lived—it seems to me to be wise that such men, when they do throw themselves into a university enterprise, should resist the very strong temptation to ask that, in exchange for their interest and effort and money, they may somehow or other dominate the thinking of the place, so that it will reflect their economic or political or social ideas. That is a great mistake. You must trust your student democracy. You must set them free with the noblest of all freedom, and that is academic freedom, the secret of which is to make your teachers happy.

The hotbeds of discontent, the schools out of which disloyalty grows, are the places in which students have come under the influence of unhappy teachers, teachers who feel that they have not had a square deal, that life has not brought to them the rewards that correspond to their real intellectual work and their real spiritual power. The first thing you know, you have boards of trustees meeting to discipline professors and you have all sorts of unhappy discussions respecting restraints of academic freedom, all of which are vain efforts to deal with the trouble, since they do not sift out the cause. The trouble never would arise where teachers are happy.

So my suggestion is—and it is only the suggestion of an onlooker—that here you have a city of as yet unrealized possibilities, a city that is still in the making, a city that perhaps has ahead of it a greater co-operative future than any other city in America. You have here, ready at hand, a great instrumentality organized for training the youth of the community in the larger and happier life. Think what it would mean if you were able to use your lives by giving them to the support and advancement of the interest of an institution like this.

Gentlemen, there are utilities of culture. The support of the University is not by any means entirely altruistic. If citizenship means anything, if the institutions which we cherish are worth preserving and worth lifting up still higher, the greatest measure of care and attention should now be lavished upon them.

We talk much about the Constitution and the merit of sound economics, about immigration and the Constitution, about the Constitution and tax reduction. Who, in God's name, is going to care for these interests unless it is an interested and enlightened citizenship? And how are we going to have such a body in any community unless the men of the community who believe in these fundamentals join their effort, their intelligence, their initiative, and their financial power to produce institutions to train the young to take our places by and by in the citizenship of the country? It comes back to the thing I said in the beginning. I said the first reason I was glad to come here was because I admire and trust Chancellor Bowman. The older I get, the more I find myself in every enterprise looking for the man who is directing it. I am willing to take long chances on an enterprise if I have confidence in the man at the head. You have here, ready at hand, not only the making of a very great university—you not only have the need for it in a community which has as yet unrealized possibilities, but you have an educational leader of whom you have every reason to be proud and in whom you have every reason to confide. I look forward with confidence that the men of this community will think big about their University as they do about business plans; that they will, as Homer Williams says, make big plans and see great visions. I believe that you will give your wealth and your very selves to make Pittsburgh the radiant city which you want it to be.

By permission of the author.

SPEECH OF RESPONSE

WILLIAM M. GERMAN, K. C., M. P.

This speech of response by William Manley German was delivered before the members of the Metropolitan Life Insurance Company of New York. Mr. German is a member of the Dominion of Canada Parliament, and is a prominent business man.

I WAS just thinking that if the Metropolitan Life Insurance Company pays its employees as generously as it feeds its guests, I am not surprised that you have the most wonderful institution in the world.

I am certainly delighted to have been here tonight. I saw that the number of my seat was 13, and I thought that was about as hard luck as we had yesterday. Know, Mr. President, that I would not only take the chances on Number 13 as a seat, but I would even walk under a ladder to be present at a gathering such as this again.

I have been entertained exceedingly by the wonderful address of the President of this great institution. He has told us some truths which should be published the world over regarding the great benefits that are being done by this great corporation. It struck me that the words of the great Nazarene were applicable: "A new commandment I give unto you; that you love one another as I have loved you." That appears to be the policy of the Metropolitan Life Insurance Company—to love its fellow men and to do good to its fellow men—and by that, of course, that great association is doing good to itself, because we all know that it pays a life insurance company to keep people alive. But, even so, by doing all that you can to prolong life, to lengthen the lives of your policyholders, you are teaching an example to the world which is worthy of being followed, and which, if followed rigorously and intelligently, would be of inestimable benefit to the whole human race. I am delighted to have been here. I wish this great institution the greatest possible success.

I notice, sir, that your work in Canada is very extensive and that you are the largest insurance company, or are doing the largest insurance business in Canada. I can easily appreciate that when I see the intelligent gentlemen who are connected with your association, and the beautiful ladies who are connected with your association, you could not help but be successful. We are glad to have in Canada great American institutions, their capital, their enterprise, their energy. They are coming here in greater numbers. We wish them to come here in greater number still, and they will find in Canada an intelligent and prosperous and healthy people, ready to advance the cause of civilization and to love one another as you are endeavoring to inculcate.

From *The Intelligencer* of the Metropolitan Life Insurance Company.

PLATFORM EXPERIENCES

GEORGE W. BAIN

George Washington Bain, author and popular Chautauqua and Lyceum lecturer, was born at Lexington, Kentucky, in 1840 and died March 28, 1927. He was known as the "grand old man of the platform."

THOUGH announced to lecture on Platform Experiences, it is my purpose to give you a kind of platform analysis, to tell you what I know about lecturing, lectures, oratory and orators, using personal experiences for illustration.

We have about eight thousand Chautauqua days, and fifteen thousand lecture courses in this country every year, and yet comparatively few persons know the history of the platform. Many have an idea that free speech, like free air, has ever been a boon to mankind. They have no conception of what it has cost, imprisonment, exile, blood and tears.

I am indebted to "Pond's History of the Platform" for facts and illustrations in the early history of the platform in England. Two hundred years ago in our mother land, the word platform meant no more than a resting place for boxes and barrels. A religious service was simply a routine of ritual, while such a thing as a public man addressing the masses was unknown. Sir William Pitt, one of England's greatest statesmen and orators, in all his public life uttered only two sentences to the public outside of Parliament. If William Jennings Bryan had lived in Pitt's day, he would have been ignored by the Prime Minister of England.

The first leaders of thought to come in contact with the people and thrill them by the power of speech were John Wesley and George Whitefield. "On a mount called Rose Hill, near Bristol, England, George Whitefield laid the foundation of the modern platform." From Rose Hill his audiences grew until on Kensington Commons thirty thousand people tried to get within reach of his captivating voice. It has been truthfully said: "At the feet of John Wesley and George Whitefield the people of England learned their first lessons in popular government."

This innovation, however, met with sneers, jeers and persecution from the established conservatism of church and state, and when the platform attempted to enter the arena of politics, Parliament decided the "public clamor must end." A bill was framed forbidding any public gatherings except such as should be called by the magistrates.

In advocating this bill a member of Parliament said: "The art of political discussion does not belong outside of Parliament. Men who are simply merchants, mechanics and farmers must not be allowed to publicly criticise the constitution." To this the platform made reply: "From such as we the Master selected those who were to sow the seed of living bread in the wilds of Galilee." The bill passed by an overwhelming majority. Punishment ran from fine and imprisonment to years of exile from the country, and from this time on, the battle raged between Parliament and platform. Later on we shall note the results.

I am often interviewed by men, and sometimes by women, who desire to reach the platform. They say to me: "What steps did you take?"

My answer is, I never took any; I stumbled, was picked up by circumstances and pitched upon the platform.

At a picnic in a grove near Winchester, Ky., in 1869, a noted temperance orator was to give an address. He failed to reach the grove on time, and I was prevailed upon to act as time-killer until his arrival. I was not entirely without experience, having belonged to a debating society in a country school.

When I had spoken about thirty minutes, to my great relief, the orator of the day made his appearance. The flattering comments upon my talk induced me to accept other invitations to address temperance meetings, and before I knew what had happened, the platform was under my feet, calls were numerous and my life work was established. I suppose those who consult me are encouraged to know a mere stumble directed my course, and if so, by purpose and preparation they can surely succeed.

Some persons seem to think lecturing a very simple occupation, requiring only a glib tongue, and a good pair of lungs. Several years ago, I received a letter from a young man in which he wrote: "I heard you lecture last week. I would like to become a lecturer myself. I have no experience and very little education, but I have a very strong voice and am sure I could be heard by a large audience. I have been working in a horse-barn but am now out of a job. If I had a lecture, I think I could make a living; besides I would get to see the country. If you will write me one I will send you two dollars." I do not know whether the young man gauged the price by the estimate of the lecture he had heard me give, or his monetary condition, but if audacity is a requisite for the platform, this young man was not entirely without qualification.

This is an extreme case, and yet there are those whose minds are storehouses of knowledge, who can no more become popular platform speakers, than could the young man, who was ready to set sail on the sea of oratory, with a lusty pair of lungs and a two dollar lecture.

Charles Spurgeon, the great London preacher, said: "I have never yet learned the art of lecturing. If you have ever seen a goose fly, you have seen Spurgeon trying to lecture."

Mr. Spurgeon called lecturing an art, and why not? If the hand that paints a picture true to life and pleasing to the eye, is the hand of an artist, why is not the tongue that paints a picture true to life and pleasing to the mind's eye the tongue of an artist?

It is an art to know how to get hold of an audience. There was an occasion in my experience when I had extreme necessity for the use of this art. When President Cleveland wrote his Venezuela message in which he threatened war with England, the threat was published in Toronto, Canada, on Saturday and I was announced to lecture in the large pavilion on Sunday afternoon.

The message of President Cleveland had aroused the patriotic spirit of Canada. The hall was packed. It seemed to me I could see frost upon the eyebrows of every man and icicles in the ears of the women.

When introduced there was a painful silence. I began by saying: "Doubtless many of you have come to hear what an American has to say about Venezuela. I must admit I am not acquainted with the merits of the question. I suppose, however, the message of our President is one of the arts of diplomacy. But I do know I speak the sentiment of the best people of my country when I say: "May the day never dawn whose peace will be broken by signal guns of war between Great Britain and the United States." I said:

"When John and Jonathan forget,
The scar of anger's wound to fret,
And smile to think of an ancient feud,
Which the God of nations turned to good;
Then John and Jonathan will be,
Abiding friends, o'er land and sea;
In their one great purpose, the world will ken,
Peace on earth, goodwill to men."

The great audience arose and cheered until all sense of chill departed.

It is not only an art to get hold of an audience, but equally a matter of good taste to know when to let go. This is a qualification some have not acquired. I followed a very distinguished man several years ago and the comment was: "He was fine the first hour and a half, but the last hour he grew tiresome."

In this busy age, the world wants thoughts packed into small compass. The average audience wants a preacher to put his best thoughts into a thirty-minute package. The day was, when people would sit on backless board benches and listen to a sermon of two hours; now they won't swing in a hammock and endure one of more than fifty minutes.

Rev. Dr. Dewey, of Brooklyn, New York, tells of a minister who was given to reading his sermons. On one occasion when he had read about twenty minutes, he halted and said: "I have a young dog at my house that is given to chewing paper. I find he has mutilated my manuscript, which is my excuse for this short sermon." A visiting lady after service said: "Doctor, have you any more of the breed of that dog? I would like to get one for our pastor."

In this age of crowded moments concentration means execution; energy means success. If you can't put fire into your sermon, put your sermon in the fire.

A few years ago when in New York City, I went to see Madame Bernhardt in her famous play, "Joan of Arc." She spoke in French, an unknown tongue to me; but when she came to her defense before the court, I realized as never before the power of speech and action. She had given one-fourth of that marvelous appeal, when the great audience arose and began to cheer. Madame Bernhardt folded her arms, bowed her head and waited for silence.

When order was restored she sprang a step forward. It seemed to me every feature of her face, every finger on her hands, every gleam of eye and movement of body was an appeal to the stern tribunal. In the trembling, murmuring voice that ran like a strain of sad, sweet music through sunless gorges of grief, the great audience read her plea for mercy and wept. Some who could not restrain their emotion sobbed aloud.

When from the depths of solemn sound that same voice arose like the swell of a silver trumpet, and in clarion tones demanded justice, cheer after cheer testified to the power of the orator actress. Never was there a sob of the sea more mournful, than the voice of Sarah Bernhardt as she played upon the harp strings of pity; and never did words rush in greater storm fury from human lips, than when she demanded justice. No stop nor note nor pedal nor key in the organ of speech was left untouched by this genius in tragic art.

It would be well if every public speaker could hear Sarah Bernhardt give that defense of the Maid of Orleans. Indeed I believe if the forensic eloquence of the stage could be transferred to the pulpit greater audiences and greater rewards would follow. If you doubt this, go read the sermons of George Whitefield or the lectures of John B. Gough and you will wonder at their success unless you take into consideration their mysterious power of delivery.

I cannot give you one sentence Madame Bernhardt uttered, but I do know the influence of that address remains with me to this day and now and then I find myself reaching out after the secret of oratory. "It is not so much what you say as how you say it," has become a proverb.

Some years ago I lectured in an Iowa village on a bitter cold evening. The rear of the hall was up on posts. When introduced there was only one inch between my shoe soles and zero, while a cold wind from a broken window struck the back of my head. It occurred to me that if I would play Bernhardt I might save a spell of pneumonia.

In a few moments I was pacing the platform, swinging my arms and stamping my feet to keep up circulation. I put all the intensity, activity and personality possible into one hour and left the platform.

Returning to the hotel a commercial traveler who had heard me a number of times said: "I congratulate you; you get younger. I never heard you put so much life into your lecture."

I replied: "Why man, I was trying to keep my feet from freezing."

"Well," he said: "I advise you to go on the platform every evening with cold feet."

John and Charles Wesley were going along a street in London when they came upon two market women engaged in a wordy war. John Wesley said: "Hold up, Charles, and let's learn how to preach. See how these women put earnestness and even eloquence into their street quarrel. Can't we be just as earnest and eloquent in dealing out the truth?" No wonder John Wesley gave such impetus to the platform.

It is said what John Wesley and George Whitefield were to the religious platform, Fox and Burke became later on to the political platform. They saw the platform was fast becoming the voice of public sentiment and dared to indorse it.

When Mr. Fox made his first platform address he said: "This is the first time I ever had the privilege of addressing an uncorrupted assembly." Going back into Parliament he said: "Let's put an end to a policy that separates us from the people. Let's cut all cables, snap all chains that bind us to an unfriendly shore and enter the peaceful harbor of public confidence."

When Mr. Burke made his platform debut, he was so inspired by the enthusiasm of the people, it is said, he made the greatest speech ever made in the English language up to that time. When he appeared in Parliament next evening a leader of the government took occasion to denounce the platform as a disturber of public peace, directing his remarks to Mr. Burke. The great orator was ready with the reply: "Yes, and the firebell at midnight disturbs public peace, but it keeps you from burning in your beds."

It would seem after years of fruitless effort to silence the platform, Parliament would accept it as a power for good and give it wise direction. Yet we are informed that in face of its growing popularity when Henry Hunt attempted to address an audience in a grove in England, a regiment of cavalry charged the grove. Eleven were killed and several hundred wounded. Henry Hunt was thrown into prison, but when released later one hundred thousand people welcomed him to the streets of London.

As well now had Parliament attempted to prevent a London fog as to prohibit platform meetings. John Bright said: "When I consider these meetings of the people, so sublime in their vastness and resolution, I see coming over the hilltops of time the dawning of a nobler and better day for my country."

It is our privilege to live in the good day of which John Bright spoke. Yet while a public speaker today is in no dread of arrest or imprisonment for any decent expression of opinion, the platform is not without its hindrances; and some of these will never be cured, while babies cry, architects sacrifice acoustics to style, young people do their courting in public, janitors smother thoughts in foul air, and milliners persist in building up artistic barriers between speaker and audience.

Here let me give a bit of advice to my own sex. Gentlemen, when you purchase a new hat, no matter if a ten dollar silk, or a twenty dollar panama, do not attend a lecture, and taking a seat in front of some intelligent lady forget to remove your hat.

The lady may want to see the speaker's face, and he may need the inspiration of her countenance, while you are interfering with both. "A hint to the wise is sufficient." This hint may not be in accord with the advice of Paul, but Paul never saw a twentieth century "Merry Widow" hat. Then, too, Paul was already inspired and didn't need the inspiration of human countenances. I am speaking for the uninspired, to whom an audience of hatless heads is an inspiration.

But few persons realize how a public speaker is affected by little influences. The flitting of a blind bat over a church audience on a summer evening, will mar the most fascinating flight of eloquence ever plumed from a pulpit.

When Nancy Hanks broke the world's trotting record at Independence, Iowa, some years ago, her former owner, Mr. Hart Boswell, of Lexington, who raised and trained her, was asked if Nancy would ever lower that record. He replied: "Well, if the time comes that the track is just right, the atmosphere just right, the driver just right and Nancy just right, I believe she will." See the combination. Break it anywhere and the brave little mare would fail.

Just so speakers are affected by conditions, by acoustics, atmosphere, size and temper of the audience, and the speaker's own mental and physical condition. Many a good sermon has been killed by a poor sexton. Many a grand thought has perished in foul air.

Charles Spurgeon was preaching to a large audience in a mission church in London, when want of ventilation affected speaker and audience. Mr. Spurgeon said to a member of the church: "Brother, lift that window near you."

"It won't lift," replied the brother.

"Then smash the glass and I'll pay the bill to-morrow," said Spurgeon.

Suppose the great horse Uhlan should be announced to trot against time, with the grandstand crowded and every condition favorable, as the great trotting wonder reached the first quarter pole, some one were to run across the track just ahead of the horse, then another and another; what kind of a record would be made?

What management would allow a horse to be thus handicapped? Where is the man who would be so inconsiderate as to thus hinder a horse? Yet when a minister has worked while the world slept, that he not only might sustain his record but gather souls into the kingdom; when the opening exercises have given sufficient time for all to be present; when the text is announced and the preacher is reaching out after the attention and sympathy of his audience some one enters the door, walks nearly the full length of the aisle; then another and then two more, each one crossing the track of the preacher and yet he is expected to keep up his record and make good. If you are a friend of your pastor be present when he announces his text; give him your attention and thus cheer him on as you would your favorite horse.

An eminent minister said: "There, I had a good thought for you, but the creaking of the new boots of that brother coming down the aisle knocked it quite out of my head."

One who had heard me many times said: "Why do you do better at Ocean Grove than anywhere else I hear you?" My answer was: "Because of conditions. The great auditorium seats ten thousand, the atmosphere is invigorated by the salt sea breezes; a choir of five hundred sing the audience into a receptive mood and the speaker is borne from climax to climax on wings of applause."

I would not have you infer from this that a large audience is always necessary to success. Indeed the most successful and satisfactory address I ever made was to an audience of one. If I can make as favorable an impression upon you as I did upon that young lady I shall be gratified.

In Pauling, New York, Chauncey M. Depew by his attention and applause inspired me more than the whole audience beside; while time and again have I been helped to do my best by the presence of that matchless queen of the platform, Frances E. Willard.

The very opposite of greatness has had the same affect upon me. At the Pontiac, Illinois, Chautauqua after lecturing to a great audience, I was invited by the superintendent of the State Reformatory to address the inmates of the prison. At the close of a thirty minutes' talk the superintendent said: "Your address to my boys exceeded the one you gave at the Chautauqua."

Why was it better? At the Chautauqua I was trying to entertain and instruct an intelligent audience. Within the grey walls of that prison I was reaching down to the very depths, endeavoring to lift up human beings, marred and scarred by sin and crime, but dear to the mothers who bore them and the Savior who died for them.

If I were a preacher in New York City and were announced to preach a sermon on home missionary work, I would not go to the church by way of the mansions of the rich where children, shod in satin slippers danced and play over velvet tapestry, but by way of the slums where I would meet the children of misery, where,

"To stand at night 'mid the city's throng,
And scan the faces that pass along,
Is to read a book whose every leaf
Is a history of woe and want and grief.
As in tears of sorrow and sin and shame,
You read a story of bright and blame,
Your heart goes further than hand can reach
And you feel a sermon you cannot preach."

Whoever would prove worthy of the platform must have a message and give to it the devotion of mind, heart and conscience, no matter whether his purpose is to convince by reasoning, convert by appeal, delight by rhetoric, or cure melancholy by humor. Each has its useful influence on the platform.

Some persons have an impression that the student deals in logic, while the orator simply starts his tongue to running, and goes off and leaves it to work automatically.

Bishop Robert McIntyre was one of the greatest pulpit orators of his age, yet I dare say this gifted man gave as much time and thought to his famous word painting of the Chicago fire, as Joseph Cook ever gave to mining any treasure of thought he laid upon the altar of education.

I know many teachers of oratory say: "Study your subject, analyze it well, and leave words to the inspiration of the occasion." But suppose when the occasion comes, instead of inspiration one has indigestion, then what?

While a speaker should not be so confined to composition that he cannot reach out after, and cage any passing bird of thought, yet as the leaf of the mulberry tree must go through the stomach of a silk-worm, before it can become silk, so climaxes should be warped and woofed into language before they can be forceful and beautiful.

At the Lincoln, Nebraska, Assembly some years ago a noted humorist gave an address on the "Philosophy of Wit." He called oratory a lost art, and to prove his contention he quoted from William Jennings Bryan's famous Chicago convention speech. He said: "What would a young woman think of her lover who would say "My darling, the crown of thorns shall never be pressed down upon your fair brow." The humorist expected applause but it failed to materialize, for Mr. Bryan is highly respected in his state and his oratory is a charm wherever he is heard.

The speaker not only exhibited poor taste, but his wit was pointless, for when a man can go before a convention of fourteen hundred delegates and by one burst of eloquence capture the convention, secure the nomination for the presidency, and then with the press and the leaders of his party against him go up and down the country, and from the rear of a railroad train, almost capture the White House, the day of oratory is not gone by.

Schriner, the great animal painter, painted the picture of a bony mule eating a tuft of hay. That picture sold in Petersburg, Russia, for fifteen thousand dollars, while the original mule sold for one dollar and thirty cents. If the painting of Schriner made in the price of that mule, a difference of fourteen thousand, nine hundred, ninety-eight dollars and seventy cents why is not word painting worth something?

Listen, while I give you a short extract from the address of James G. Blaine at the memorial service of our martyr President Garfield. With the audience wrought up to the greatest sympathy by his tribute he said:

> "Surely if happiness can come from robust health, ideal domestic life and honors of the world James A. Garfield was a happy man that July morning. One moment strong, erect with promise of peaceful, useful years of life before him: The next moment wounded, bleeding, helpless.
>
> "Through the days and weeks of agony that followed, he saw his sun slowly sinking, the plans and purposes of his life broken and the sweetest of household ties soon to be severed.
>
> "Masterful in mortal weakness he became the center of a nation's love, and enshrined in the prayers of the Christian world.
>
> "As the end drew near, his youthful yearning for the sea returned. The White House palace of power became a hospital of pain. He begged to be taken from its prison walls and stifling air.
>
> "Silently, tenderly the love of a great people bore the pale sufferer to the longed-for healing of the sea. There with wan face lifted to the cooling breeze, he looked wistfully out upon the changing wonders of the ocean; its far-off sails white in the morning light; its restless waves rolling shoreward to break in the noon day sun; the red clouds of evening arching low, kissing the blue lips of the sea, and above the serene, silent pathway to the stars.
>
> "Let us believe his dying eyes read a mystic meaning only the parting soul can know; that he heard the waves of the ebbing tide of life breaking on the far-off shore, and felt already upon his wasted brow the calm, sweet breath of heaven's morning."

Place behind these utterances the rich voice and magnetic manner of the "Plumed Knight" of the platform, and you can realize what oratory means.

If you will here pardon me for going from the sublime to the ridiculous, I will show you how a bit of school boy rhetoric may win its way over solid argument. In the country school I attended, there was a debating society. Parents as well as their sons, were admitted to the society and the public was invited to the debates. On one occasion the question for debate was: "Which is the more attractive, the works of nature or the works of art?"

There had been an appeal from a general debate and this time one speaker was chosen from each side. My father was chosen to represent the negative and I the affirmative. My father was a good speaker but so fond of facts that he had no use for rhetoric. I had the opening address of thirty minutes, my father had forty-five minutes and I had fifteen minutes to close the debate.

As father talked I wondered how he ever got hold of so many facts. He piled them up until my first address was swept away by the triumphs of art. The only hope I had for the affirmative was in the closing fifteen minutes. Fortunately for me, the judge was a bachelor and very much in love with a golden-haired, accomplished young woman who lived in a country home very near the schoolhouse, and was then in the audience. In closing the debate I referred to father's address in a complimentary manner, and then asked the judge to be seated in imagination on a knoll near by. On one side of that knoll I placed all my father had claimed for art, withholding nothing. On the other side was the home of this Blue Grass belle. I began a description of her home and personality. I pictured "the orchard, the meadow, the deep tangled wildwood and every loved spot" the judge well knew. I pictured the brook that ran through the meadow into the woodland and on down the valley, singing as it ran:

"I wind about and in and out,
  With here a blossom sailing;
Here and there a lusty trout,
  And here and there a grey-ling."

When my time was half gone I felt I was gone too unless I could get a little nearer the heart of the judge. Opening the door art had made to shut in the flowers of a lovely family I brought out the golden-haired girl.

Taking off the sun-bonnet of art, that the good-night kisses of the sinking sun might enrich her rosy cheeks and golden tresses, I sent her strolling down the winding walk hedged in by hawthorn and hyacinth to the water's brink. Here I gave her a cushion of blue-grass, and with the rising moon pouring its shimmering sheen upon the ripples at her feet, I sent her voice floating away on the evening air singing: "Roll on silver moon, guide the traveler on his way." Here the audience cheered, the judge smiled and I felt encouraged.

With but two minutes left I had the shapely fingers of nature take out the hair-pins of art and the golden tresses fall about the snowy neck of nature. Then came the untying of the shoestrings of art; off came the shoes and stockings of art, and the pretty feet of nature were dipping in the limpid stream. I said, "Judge, the question is, which is the more attractive, the works of nature or the works of art? With my father's picture of steam engines, stage coaches, reapers, binders, mowing machines and every known triumph of art on one side, on the other the highest type of the world's creation, a beautiful woman, the stars of nature stooping to kiss her brow, and laughing waters of nature leaping to kiss her feet; where your eyes would rest there let your decision be given."

After the debate a friend said to me: "It was that last home picture that saved you." My father who heard the remark said, "Yes, a picture of a red-headed girl washing her feet in a goose branch." I may add, I was careful after the contest not to get very near the young lady with whom I had taken such platform liberty.

Reason, rhetoric, pathos, poetry, diction, gesture, wit and humor, each has its place on the platform. While logic sounds the depths of thought, humor ripples its surface with laughing wavelets. While reason cultivates the cornfields of the mind, rhetoric beautifies the pleasure gardens.

John B. Gough was the most popular platform orator of his day. He began lecturing at from two to five dollars an evening. He grew in popularity until he was in demand at five hundred dollars a lecture, and no one before or since more successfully used all the arts of the platform, from the comic that drew the very rabble of the streets, to flights of eloquence that captured college culture. It has been well said: "While Gough was a great preacher of righteousness, he was a whole theatre in dramatic delivery." Lecturers, like preachers, are fishers of men, and there are as many kinds of people in an average audience as there are kinds of fish in the sea. It requires variety of bait for humanity as well as for fish.

Sam Jones used slang as one bait and he used to say: "It beats all how it draws." I saw this verified at Ottawa, Kansas, Chautauqua. Giving a Saturday evening lecture he baited the platform with slang, satire and humor. Sunday afternoon an hour before time for his lecture the people were hurrying to the auditorium. When presented to the great audience he said: "Record! Record! Record!" I remember the sermon as one of the sweetest and most powerful I ever heard. Its influence will not cease this side the eternal morning.

Rowland Hill, the popular London preacher, used quaint humor to draw the people, and powerful appeal to sweep them into the kingdom.

It is said the fountain of laughter and fountain of tears lie very close together. My experience has been, that often the best way to the fountain of tears is by the way of the fountain of laughter. Some years ago at Ocean Grove, New Jersey, I was to lecture on the subject, "Boys and Girls, Nice and Naughty." A wealthy widow and her only son were there from New York, where the young boy had been leading a "gay life." Ocean Grove with its quiet, moral atmosphere was a dull place for this young man. He happened to read the subject for the lecture on the bulletin board, and thinking it suggestive of humor he went to hear the lecture. He had what he went for, as the lecture did deal with the fountain of laughter, but it also dealt with the fountain of tears. It swung the red lantern of danger athwart the pathway of the wayward young man. Following a story of mother love, I said: "Young man, let the cares and burdens of life press you down to the very earth, let the great waves of sorrow roll over your soul, but let no act of yours ever roll a clod upon the coffin of her, whose image, enshrined upon the inner walls of your memory, white winters and long bright summers can never wash away."

A minister told me after, that in a young people's meeting this young man arose and said: "I attended a lecture at Ocean Grove, thinking I would have a humorous entertainment. I left the auditorium the saddest soul in the great audience. Going down to the beach I tried to drive away the spell, but it grew upon me. I could see how I had grieved my mother, and the past came rolling up like the waves of the ocean. I shuddered as they broke on my awakened conscience and quickened memory. Behind me was an unhallowed past, and before me the brink of an awful eternity. There and then I resolved to change my course. Along under the stars I made my resolve and then started to my mother. She was waiting for me, and said: 'My son, I wished for you at the lecture this evening. I think you would have enjoyed it.' I then told her I was determined to lead a new life and had come to seal my vow with her kiss."

That young man went to the lecture to laugh, he left to walk alone with God under the stars by the ocean deep, there to decide to lead a righteous life, and seal the vow with a loving mother's kiss.

So while in my humble way I have endeavored to use the arts that entertain I have cherished the purpose to better human lives.

I have referred to the platform as being baited for humanity. Have you ever considered how it is baited to resist the forces of evil?

The day was when Satan had an attraction trust that controlled about the whole output of entertainment. The platform now is a picture gallery where is to be had all beauty in nature, from our own land to the land of the midnight sun.

In moving pictures it presents to those who never saw ship, sail or sea, the landing of a great steamer, with splashing of spray as real as if seen from the dock. To those who enjoy music it furnishes band concerts, orchestra, bell-ringing, quartettes, solos, plantation melodies, rag-time tunes and women whistlers.

The platform today beats the devil in output of entertainment. It has scoured field and forest, trained birds and dogs to round out the program of a Chautauqua.

Its breadth takes in all creeds and kinds. While it greets with waving lilies Bishop Vincent, leader of the great Chautauqua movement, it cordially welcomes the priest, the Jew, the Chinaman, the Negro, republican, democrat, progressive, prohibitionist, socialist and suffragist.

The platform has grown to be a great university, a musical festival, a zoological garden, an art institute, an agricultural college and a domestic science school.

Do you ask has the platform any blemishes? I answer yes. All enterprises have their blemishes. The press is a potent power for good and yet many bad things get into print. Sometimes from the platform come voices without the ring of sincerity, entertainments without uplifting influence and anecdotes without respect to public decency. When attending platform entertainments one should discriminate as when eating fish, enjoy the meat and discard the bones. With good taste in selection one rarely ever need go away hungry.

I am often asked: "Where do you find the most appreciative audiences?"

First, I would reply, in rural communities where the people are not surfeited with entertainment. Second, I would say, applause does not always mean appreciation. It is said "still water runs deep." In Chickering Hall, New York, one Sunday afternoon a lady sat before me whose diamonds and dress indicated wealth. A lad sat by her side. My subject was, "The Safe Side of Life for Young Men." It was a temperance address and the thought came to me: that lady is a wine drinker and she is disappointed that I am to talk temperance. She did not cheer with the audience, nor did she give any expression of face that would indicate her interest, except that she kept her eyes fixed upon the speaker. At the close she came to the platform and said: "I brought my son with me and you said what I wanted him to hear; I thank you," and with this she took my hand saying, "again I thank you," and turning away, left a coin in my hand.

I put it in my pocket, and on returning to the hotel found she had given me a twenty dollar gold piece. That was gold standard appreciation.

I am frequently asked: "What do you recall as the best introduction you ever had?"

I have had all kinds, some amusing, but the one I cherish most was given by Ferd Schumacher, the deceased oatmeal king of Akron, Ohio. He came to this country from Germany. By industry and economy he accumulated enough money to engage in making oatmeal. When he had rounded up more than a million of dollars in wealth, the insurance ran out on his great "Jumbo Mills" in Akron. The insurance company raised the rate and while he was dickering with the company, the great plant was swept away in a midnight fire. Mr. Schumacher was a very earnest temperance man and was to introduce me for the W.C.T.U. in the large armory the Sunday after the fire. It was supposed he would not be present because of the severe strain and his great loss. But prompt to the minute he entered the door, and 'mid the applause of sympathetic friends he took the platform.

In presenting the speaker he said: "Ladies and schentlemen, I must be personal for a moment while I thank the people of Akron for their sympathy. I did not know I had so many good friends. But the mill vot vos burned vos made of stone and vood and nails and paint. We come to talk to you about a fire vot is burning up the homes, the hopes, the peace of vimen, and children and the immortal souls of men; vill you please take your sympathy off of Ferd Schumacher and give it to Mr. Bain while he talks about the great fire of intemperance."

I am opposed to indiscriminate immigration to this country, but if the Old World has any more Ferd Schumachers desiring to come to America, may He who rules winds and waves, fill with harmless pressure the billows on which they ride and give them safe entrance into our country's haven.

Many inquire of me about the lyceum platform as a profession. My answer is: "like the famed shield it has two sides." One who has a lovely home and rarely leaves it said to me: "I envy you your life-work. You get to see the country, visit the great cities, meet the best people and get fat fees for your lectures." How distance does lend enchantment to the view sometimes!

A few years ago we notified the bureaus not to make engagements away from the railroads in the northwest during the blizzard months. A letter came saying: "Enter Wessington College, outside of Woonsocket." We supposed outside meant adjacent. Arriving at Woonsocket in a blizzard I found Wessington seventeen miles away. Wrapped in robes I made the drive, arriving about six o'clock in the evening. On arrival I was informed that smallpox had broken out in the village. The hotel had been quarantined but a room had been engaged for me in a private home. While taking my supper my hostess said: "Would you know smallpox if you were to see the symptoms?"

"Know what? Why do you ask that?" I asked.

She called attention to the face of her daughter who was serving the supper. One glance and my appetite fled, as I said: "Excuse me, please. I must get ready for my lecture," and I left the room. One hour later I stood before a vaccinated audience with visions of smallpox floating before me, and for days after I imagined I could feel it coming.

Add to this experience midnight rides on freight trains, long drives in rain, mud and storm, ten minutes for lunch at sandwich counter, eight months of the year away from home—the only heaven one who loves his family has on earth, and you have a taste of the side my neighbor did not see.

There is, however, a bright side. Whoever can get the ear of the public from the platform, has an opportunity to sow seed, the fruit of which will be gathered by angels when he has gone to his reward. One so long on the platform as I have been, cannot fail in having experiences that gladden the heart, if he has done faithful service.

Out of hundreds I select one experience that should encourage all who labor in the Master's vineyard. I had traveled two hundred miles in a day to reach an engagement, and the last seven miles in a buggy over a miserable road. I did not reach the village until nine o'clock. Without supper and chilled by the ride, I threw off my wraps and wearily made my way through the lecture. A little later in my room at the hotel, while I was taking a lunch of bread and milk, a minister entered and said: "You seem to be very tired." When I answered, "Never more so," he replied: "I have a story to tell you which will perhaps rest you."

Continuing he said: "Some twenty years ago, you lectured in a village where there was a state normal school. It was Sunday evening. At the hotel were three young men, and to see the girls of the college, these young men went to the lecture. One was the only son of a wealthy widow. He had not seen his mother for months. She had begged him to come home, but he was sowing his wild oats and ashamed to face his mother. That evening you made an earnest appeal to young men in the name of home and mother. The arrow went to the heart of the wild young fellow. On returning to the hotel he said to his companions: 'Come up to my room, let's have a talk.' On entering the room he closed the door and said: 'Boys, I want to open my heart to you. I am overwhelmed with a sense of wrong-doing. I am done with the saloon, done with the gambling table, done with evil associations. I am going home to-morrow and make mother happy. Boys, let's join hands and swear off from drink and evil habits: let's honor our manhood and our mothers.'

"Now for the sequel that I think will rest you. That wild boy is now a wealthy man. I give you his name, though I would not have you call it in public. He is a Christian philanthropist, and has never broken his pledge. The second boy holds the highest office in the gift of this government in a western territory, and the third stands before you now, an humble minister of the gospel."

It did rest me. I would rather have been the humble instrument in turning those three young men to a righteous life, than to wear the brightest wreath that ever encircled a statesman's brow.

For such men as Sylvester Long, Roland A. Nichols, Robert Parker Miles and Bishop Robert McIntyre to tell me my lectures helped to shape their lives, fills my soul with joy as I face the setting sun.

Chance, the noted English engineer, built a thousand sea-lights, shore-lights and harbor-lights. When in old age he lay dying, a wild storm on the sea seemed to revive him by its association with his life-work. He said to the watchers: "Lift me up and let me see once more the ocean in a storm."

As he looked out, the red lightning ripped open the black wardrobe of the firmament, and he saw the salted sea driven by the fury of the hurricane into great billows of foam. Sinking back upon his pillows his last words were: "Thank God, I have been a lighthouse builder, and though the light of my life is fast fading, the beams of my lighthouse are brightening the darkness of many a sailor's night."

When my life-work closes, and my platform experiences are ended, I would ask no better name than that of an humble lighthouse builder, who here and there from the shore-points of life's ocean, has sent out a friendly beam, to brighten the darkness of some brother's night.

By permission of the author.

COLLEGE LIBRARY

Date Due

F15Apr'37	[illegible]ar'37		
19Apr'37	19Apr'37		
20Jy'43	7Jul'43		
14May'47	19May47		
4May'50	21Apr'50		
MAY 18 '54	MAY 5		
APR 19 '67	ML		
		[illegible]R24	
NOV 26 1990	NOV 14 1990		

Do not Send to Binding

UNIVERSITY OF FLORIDA
3 1262 04370278 5

808.85
L745m2
c.2

UNIVERSITY OF FLORIDA
LIBRARY

800